FBIS DAILY REPORT

CONTENTS

Soviet Union

Vol III No 221 17 November 1986

USSR INTERNATIONAL AFFAIRS

ARMS CONTROL & DISARMAMENT

'Studio 9' Program on Post-Reykjavik Situation [Zorin, Arbatov, Sagdeyev] AA 1
Falin Interview on Reykjavik [Warsaw TRYBUNA LUDU 10 Nov] AA 15

COMMUNIST RELATIONS

Pact Military Council Meeting Results Reported [IZVESTIYA 15 Nov] BB 1
Vietnam's Truong Chinh Departs From Moscow BB 1
Commentary Denies 'Conjecture' on CEMA Summit [Pasko] BB 2
SOVETSKAYA ROSSIYA Assesses Results of CEMA [12 Nov] BB 3

WORLD & REGIONAL AFFAIRS

Weekly 'International Observers Roundtable' [Kolchanov, Lebedev, Zholkver] CC 1
CSCE Delegate Criticizes U.S. Human Rights Record CC 8
AFP Version CC 8
Kola Missiles Withdrawal Cited [AFP] CC 9
KRASNAYA ZVEZDA Cites Tatarnikov Speech [14 Nov] CC 10

UNITED STATES & CANADA

Continuing Comments on U.S. Arms to Iran A 1
'Growing Scandal' [Kalyagin, Dunayev] A 1
Dunayev: 'New Watergate' Shown A 2
PRAVDA Criticism [Gan, 15 Nov] A 3
IZVESTIYA Comments [Blinov, 15 Nov] A 4
Continued Contacts Criticized [Sheftunov] A 5
Kudrin Quotes Participants A 6
Turkatenko Views Aim of Sales A 8
Commentaries Hit U.S. Sanctions Against Syria A 9
Attempt to 'Distract Public' [Lapin] A 9
Kulik Raps U.S. 'Allegations' A 10
Reagan Signs National Defense Authorization Act A 11

CHINA

Chinese Acrobats Arrive in Leningrad 13 Nov B 1
Moscow Radio Notes Russian Art Show in PRC [Peace and Progress] B 1
Commentary Views Economic Cooperation With PRC [Ivanov, Peace and Progress] B 1
Moscow Radio Views PRC Industrial Project Aid [Peace and Progress] B 2

NORTHEAST ASIA

Japanese Deputy Foreign Minister Visits Moscow C 1
Meets With Shevardnadze C 1
Holds Talks With Kapitsa C 2
'Broad Masses' Opposed to SDI Participation [Potapov] C 2

SOUTH ASIA

Shevardnadze Receives Bangladesh Envoy 11 Nov [PRAVDA 13 Nov] D 1
Shevardnadze Receives Indian Ambassador 11 Nov D 1
Talks, Protocol With Indian Minister Concluded D 2
KRASNAYA ZVEZDA Views Service in Panjsher Valley D 2
[8 Nov]

SOUTHEAST ASIA & PACIFIC

Further Reportage on Aliyev Talks in Vientiane E 1
Meets Cambodia's Heng Samrin E 1
Aliyev, Kaysone Hold Talks E 1

MIDDLE EAST & NORTH AFRICA

Syria's Talas Receives General Ivanovskiy H 1
[KRASNAYA ZVEZDA 13 Nov]
PRAVDA Comments on UK-U.S. 'Anti-Syrian Campaign' H 1
[Maslennikov, Glukhov, and Peresada, 12 Nov]
New Envoy Appointed to Republic of Tunisia H 3
Zverev Replaces Akopov as Envoy to Kuwait H 3

SUB-SAHARAN AFRICA

Embassy in Maputo Denies Machel Black Box Pact [Luanda] J 1
Ambassador to Mauritania Replaced by Komogorov J 1
[PRAVDA 10 Nov]
Briefs: Delegation Visits Tanzania J 1

NATIONAL AFFAIRS

POLITICAL & SOCIAL DEVELOPMENTS

Supreme Soviet Presidium Holds Session
Ratifies Accident Convention R 1
Reservation on Convention R 1
Leaders at Session R 2
Supreme Soviet Session Begins; Gorbachev Attends R 2
Sokolov Present at Session R 2
Agenda Confirmed R 3
Marchuk, Shalayev Speak R 3
Talyzin Delivers Report R 4
Gostev Speaks on Budget R 5
First Joint Session Ends R 5
[Vasilyeva]
Separate Debates Begin R 6
Gorbachev Speaks on State Acceptance of Products R 6
[PRAVDA 16 Nov]
Zaykov Addresses Meeting R 12
Demichev at Joint Meeting of Youth Commissions R 12

AGRICULTURAL AFFAIRS

Early November Weather, Crops Status Reported T 1
[Ignatova in SELSKAYA ZHIZN 14 Nov]
Agricultural Developments for 11-14 Nov Reported T 1

SCIENTIFIC AFFAIRS

TASS Notes Cosmos, Molniya Satellite Launches U 1
Cosmos-1791 Nov 13 U 1
Cosmos-1792 Nov 13 U 1
Molniya-1 Nov 16 U 1

MILITARY DEVELOPMENTS

Leaders Receive Further GOSR Greetings
SRV Sends Greetings V 1
[IZVESTIYA 7 Oct]
DPRK Greets Ryzhkov V 2
[PRAVDA 9 Nov]
Lao Leaders Send Message V 3
[PRAVDA 9 Nov]
Ortega Greets Gorbachev V 4
[IZVESTIYA 13 Nov]
Hasani Greets Gromyko V 5
[PRAVDA 9 Nov]

'STUDIO 9' PROGRAM ON POST-REYKJAVIK SITUATION

OW151111 Moscow Television Service in Russian 0630 GMT 15 Nov 86

["Studio 9" program presented by Professor Valentin Sergeyevich Zorin, political observer of Soviet Television and Radio, with Academician Georgiy Arkadyevich Arbatov, director of the United States of American and Canada Institute of the USSR Academy of Sciences, and Academician Roald Zinnurovich Sagdeyev, director of the Space Research Institute of the USSR Academy of Sciences]

[Text] [Zorin] Hello comrades, we are meeting with you in Studio 9 of the Ostankino Television Center in order to discuss current world political problems. At the Studio 9 table today are leading Soviet scientists, Academician Georgiy Arkadyevich Arbatov, director of the United States of America and Canada Institute of the USSR Academy of Sciences, and Academician Roald Zinnurovich Sagdeyev, Director of the Space Research Institute of the USSR Academy of Sciences.

The importance of some political events becomes bigger instead of smaller with the passing of time. That is what is happening with the Soviet-U.S. summit meeting in Reykjavik. Since Reykjavik, it has become evident that the world political agenda has practically changed, it is different now, with different points of reference and different criteria, as a result of what happened in the Icelandic capital and, at the same time, it becomes apparent that, on the other side, they are trying not to notice this, conducting affairs in the old way, moving along the old rut. It has been discovered that Washington not only tries to distort what was discussed in Reykjavik, but also tries, in the most substantial way, to distance itself from agreements reached there and to dismantle those agreements.

This became particularly manifest recently during the meeting between Comrade Shevardnadze, Soviet minister of foreign affairs, and Secretary of State Shultz in Vienna. In recent history, there have not been many precedents for a great power trying so quickly and so substantially to reject its own words and obligations. Georgiy Arkadyevich, why do you think this has happened.

[Arbatov] You know, I would begin with the simplest and most obvious things. In any business, like in this business -- that is the arms race -- some make a profit, and others a loss. But, as things stand in America, those who lose do not have much of a say. They can vote once every 2 years in the Congressional elections, and once every 4 years in the Presidential elections. Now those who profit, the military-industrial complex, -- there is no need to simplify matters, there are other things besides profits, like position in society and power -- depend directly on the arms race; their prosperity depends on little, or rather large, amounts of money from the taxpayers being used for the arms race.

I would say that this section of the U.S. ruling class has a Mafia-style organization; it has some kind of Mafia style. There, more than in any other section of U.S. business -- which has never been known for its high morals and manners -- we have bribery, intimidation, political blackmail, and so forth. But these are the first and most obvious things.

Then there are other things. You see, in Reykjavik the door was opened slightly and revealed a different world, a nuclear-free world. I am certain that this picture aroused a sigh of relief and raised high hopes among the majority of people on earth.

But there were people, politicians -- and I am disinclined to suspect all of them of very selfish and evil intentions -- with whom it may just be the inertia of thought, that very old way of thinking under which they simply cannot visualize any different life. They have grown as used to conditions as to some of their own birthmarks or warts. This frightened them. All of a sudden, we saw how the very same people who, theoretically, seemed to be in favor of a nuclear-free world and so forth, start retreating all of a sudden -- not only in America, but in Europe too.

[Sagdeyev] I have just returned from the United States, where I had an opportunity to observe the process of discussion after Reykjavik; to talk to many scientists and political leaders, and I have to say that many representatives of the U.S. community -- business circles, and political leaders, including those who are realistically minded with respect to the need for the detente and disarmament process -- strongly criticize the entire concept and all the preparations conducted by the Reagan team before Reykjavik. In conclusion, they think that Reykjavik has exposed, to a considerable extent, the adventurism of the present administration.

[Arbatov interrupts] The story most probably comes from the version: An old man with a weak memory, who makes mistakes, and who does not always grasp everything all at once went [to Reykjavik], and the insidious Russians took advantage of this. They used some of his slips of the tongue and mistakes, and attributed a version to him, and almost enticed him, dragged him into very nearly the trap which slammed shut. I have also heard this.

I have to tell you, I was told by a prominent American recently -- he did give me his name, and I did not ask for his name -- but one of the U.S. foreign policy officials who stayed at home said, on learning about the outcome of Reykjavik: Thank God that he -- that is the President -- did not sign anything. That was the reaction of a number of people. But it is simply not possible to accept this version. I already had to talk about this in one of the previous Studio 9 programs. REF OW151111 Moscow Television Service Russian 150630///Studio 9 programs

[Arbatov continues] That is incorrect. The Americans did not have the right and should not have come unprepared. There should have been no surprises for them. What the Soviet Union spoke about, what was contained in the three-page proposals, and what was later the subject of discussion between Comrade Gorbachev and President Reagan was a direct continuation and the logical development of everything the Soviet Union had said in all channels -- in public, in correspondence with Reagan, at the level of foreign ministers, and at the talks during the entire past year, beginning with Comrade Gorbachev's January statement on the complete elimination of nuclear arms by the end of the current century. So it is absolute nonsense. They should have known what to expect and they should have been prepared. Nevertheless, I cannot exclude the possibility they were not prepared. And here arises the question: Why?

[Sagdeyev] I think that they have convinced themselves that everything we do is propaganda. And this is how they started with our moratorium on nuclear tests...

[Arbatov interrupts] That is correct.

[Sagdeyev] Later they understood that the moratorium was a serious proposal. And I remember that they even had a very interesting article about the moratorium apparently being a serious proposal. That means that things are bad for us.

[Arbatov interrupts] That was the article's headline, right?

[Sagdeyev] Yes.

[Arbatov] You know, I think there could be a second element. They could also have convinced themselves of something else. They started inventing the story that we have such domestic problems, such different views among the leadership, and they simply deceived themselves, convinced themselves that the Soviet Union could not come up with some kind of serious, far-reaching proposals on arms limitation.

Well, one has to pay for such miscalculations. After all, both the President and Shultz were of sound mind. And you know, speaking frankly, I feel somewhat sorry for Shultz. He is a respectable, elderly man. I first met him when Nixon was in power. He has a great biography, with great achievements in the business world and some achievements in politics.

I remember Shultz at his press conference immediately after Reykjavik. That was a tragic picture. It was evident that this man spoke with great pain about achievement being so close and then later turning out to be unattainable. It was an entirely different Shultz at his press conference after Vienna. It was no longer Shultz. He spoke there like Charles Wick, the chief of the United States propaganda agency, with cunning moves, efforts to confuse the agenda, to make the main item human rights -- although we are ready to discuss them too, and are ready to discuss more deeply than the U.S. is apparently ready to do now. Frankly I was offended at the way Reykjavik and the position of the Soviet Union was presented.

[Zorin] Georgiy Arkadyevich, what is the matter, why are they trying to dismantle the agreements reached in Reykjavik on the issues it was possible to agree on? Are they too unexpected and new and the United States is not ready for them, or are powerful forces in Washington, for which no agreements are suitable, responsible?

[Arbatov] I think that both causes are important. First there is the military-industrial complex, which is a very powerful section of the ruling class. So far, it knows how to defend its interests, forcing others to listen even when what it advocates is contrary to the interests of the entire ruling class. I would not be afraid to say that. You see, when we submitted our proposals in Reykjavik and earlier, when we first made proposals, we were not naive people. We understood that there would not be any agreement if what we propose is contrary to the interests of the United States -- the United States as it is now, not some future or ideal United States, but the United States with its ruling class, its system, all that we consider a reality -- and that meets the interests of the U.S. ruling class and without doubt meets the interests of U.S. society. Now that section, that very powerful section -- despite the fact that it is not the majority -- is today especially influential with the present administration. And here Comrade Gorbachev has called the administration a prisoner of the military-industrial complex, and that is correct. On the other hand, this administration is very close to the military-industrial complex ideologically and spiritually. And even geographically. The President comes from a region where these interests are very strong.

[Zorin] Reagan's political base is California, and 47 percent of military contracts for the 1983 to 1986 period have gone precisely to the military corporations in California. Apparently, much of what is happening in Washington now in attempting to retreat from Reykjavik, and that has become apparent in Vienna, can be traced to this.

[Arbatov] If you look around and study the various ties, this undoubtedly plays a large part, not precluding the President, a man with position, from either rising above this or not. To rise to the level of this position and to become a leader. This has happened on many occasions, and this is why we are very seriously talking with Reagan. This man must represent the American people and their interests. He is under pressure, and here lies the difficulty of politics.

[Zorin] I think the idea that the interests of the military-industrial complex are not necessarily the interests of the whole ruling class is a serious idea.

[Sagdeyev] I feel that we are simply observing this and witnessing this struggle between two trends within the ruling group -- between the military-industrial complex and those circles aspiring particularly to the development of trade relations with us. Recently, I visited a large organization in New York, which unites business circles, politicians, and scientists. I have in mind the New York Council.

[Arbatov] Of Foreign Relations.

[Sagdeyev] ... of Foreign Relations.

[Arbatov] One could say that this is the foreign relations elite of the U.S. East Coast.

[Sagdeyev] I was asked to speak about SDI and about our attitude to SDI, and then I was asked a question about the peaceful use of space, about joint flights and, in particular, about a manned flight to Mars. I said that the flight was expensive and it is doubtful that it could be realized in the near future, and someone who participated in this meeting, one of the American participants, made a caustic joke: What a pity! We would have offered Richard Perle to you for transportation to Mars. There was friendly laughter.

[Zorin] I would like to enlighten those viewers to whom the name Richard Perle means little. He is one of the superhawks in Washington, Weinberger's right-hand man, one of the inspirers of the Pentagon's hardest lines, and one of the most hawkishly inclined figures in Washington.

Gregoriy Arkadyevich, could it be that among those who have now spoken out against the radical decisions reached by the Soviet and American leaders in Reykjavik, are not only those who are ill-meaning people, but also those who are honestly mistaken? That among them are those who are quite sincerely frightened that these radical measures might cause harm to security, since it breaks the stereotype of the political thinking which has formed over the past 40 years.

[Arbatov] Certainly, people like that do exist. They certainly do exist because, really, over the past decade many in the West throught, and this belief was, and is being, artificially supported, that good or bad, we have lived for 40 years without a war because of the fear of a nuclear catastrophe. How then can we reject nuclear weapons?

First, I would say, I have doubts that we have lived for 40 years without a war because of nuclear weapons. Perhaps, Lady Luck can claim most of the credit for this. On many occasions, we approached the very edge of the abyss. Secondly, how would you react to the following conclusion?

An old man says to you: I have lived for 70 years and have not died once! That means that I will live for the next 70 years. You would answer: What about old age, decrepitude, and illness? But the processes that are taking place here are no less dangerous.

The very logic of the arms race is leading us to the brink, beyond which everything becomes uncontrollable, where catastrophe becomes quite feasible. These arms race dynamics, all those tendencies which are now acting in the world, could make the catastrophe inevitable. SDI is a shining example of this.

[Zorin] The following argument is often heard. Nuclear weapons would be liquidated, but conventional arms would remain, and then a war with conventional weapons would become more probable and perhaps even unavoidable.

[Arbatov] Well, first of all NATO, even now in the presence of nuclear weapons realizing that its use is suicidal, is already increasing its stake on so-called conventional arms. Now, an incomparably greater part of the funds is being spent, not on nuclear arms, but on those types of arms. Secondly, there is practically the same fear for conventional war as there is for nuclear war, and this is best understood in Europe. Therefore, the deterrent effect here for people who more or less understand what is happening, is the same. This is correct. I am not even speaking of the fact that the destructiveness of conventional weapons is becoming such that the difference between them and nuclear weapons is disappearing.

[Zorin interrupts] Conventional is just a conditional term.

[Arbatov] Yes, they are quite unconventional. There is however, another matter. Take Europe, for example. There are 150 nuclear reactors in Europe, or perhaps slightly more, similar to the one at Chernobyl. Just imagine that this reactor becomes a target for a conventional bombardment or artillery shelling. We, who have lived through the Chernobyl tragedy, and our neighbors who were startled by it, understand what this means. In a word, these are the facts.

It is precisely because of this, I feel, that it is very important to keep in mind that our policy is not concerned with merely obtaining the liquidation of nuclear arms and thereby sweeping the arms race onto another plane, but with making the liquidation of nuclear arms the first big, I would say enormous, step on the path of liquidating war, to affirming a universal system of international security. This can be seen from our proposals. We are fully aware of this tie and this logic. Our proposals are on the table and we are waiting for a reply from the West.

[Zorin] I would like to draw attention to another negative situation of the post-Reykjavik period. This is a great deal of talk, including at the highest levels in Washington, that the policy of strength is precisely the best way to deal with the Soviet Union. In particular, the administration considers the Star Wars program, the SDI, as the concentrated expression of this policy. And Washington asserts that this policy forces the Soviet Union to the negotiating table, to put forward their constructive proposals, and so forth. What do you think, Georgiy Arkadyevich, what can be said in regard to this?

[Arbatov] Well, what could be said in regard to this? It is hogwash, as is much in the dealings of this adminstration. I would put it like this.

The administration is forced to speak differently at different times of the year. Now that the main military budget debates have passed, it can speak about its position of strength. After several months, the military budget debates will resume, and the administration will say that the Russians have superiority. The Americans are simply lying when they assert that we were supposedly almost dragged to the negotiating table, under the SDI threat, so to speak.

Admittedly, they occasionaly speculate on the events of 1983 and 1984, when we, in response to the deployment of U.S. intermediate-range missiles in Europe, left the talks and then returned to the negotiating table. I would not be inclined to argue that either of these steps was done with irreproachable elegance. But they simply had nothing to do with U.S. strength and the SDI. The balance of power did not change during the year in which there were no talks. In fact, it did not change throughout all the years of the Reagan administration. They managed to spend more than a trillion dollars -- a trillion and a quarter -- to increase the state debt, but the balance of power did not change.

We are holding talks not because we are scared of the SDI or of U.S. power, but because we realize how dangerous are the tendencies that are working in the world. Our flexibility is not due to fear of U.S. power, but because we wish to find a solution to the problem. This is due to an understanding of the true realities of the contemporary world, from the fact that we truly fear these tendencies that are dragging us to great misfortune. And by the way, these tendencies are just as dangerous to the Americans as they are to us, and they should avoid them as well.

It has already become very difficult to reach agreement, and Comrade Gorbachev has repeatedly said this. But with each month, not to mention each year, it is becoming more and more difficult. The development of military technology and the changes in the world situation are pushing us inexorably, if we continue to drag these talks, to that brink beyond which agreement will perhaps become impossible. That is why we are seeking outcomes. Certainly not because of the SDI, which remains a fantasy, the fruit of a sick imagination, and which, at best, exists only in some form on the drawing board.

[Zorin] Now, I would like to continue our discussion precisely from this point, Georgiy Arkadyevich. SDI could, to some extent, now be in fact called an axis, or one of the main axes...

[Arbatov interrupts] Stumbling block, I would say.

[Zorin] Yes, both an axis of U.S. foreign policy and a stumbling block. Now, insofar as we have Roald Zinnurovich with us at the table, I would like to ask you, the director of the Space Research Institute, Roald Zinnurovich: Is the idea underlying this Star Wars program, what they call the Strategic Defense Initiative, realistic?

[Sagdeyev] Well, I would like to say that, in fact, there are several programs, not one program. Now, if we discuss the very first one, President Reagan's dream, which he expressed in 1983, of creating an ideal, impenetrable shield which would completely eliminate the nuclear threat, then, of course, this is a totally irrational dream and absolutely unrealistic.

[Zorin] Why?

[Sagdeyev] Even if the opposing side did nothing at all, if it froze everything as is, the probability of 100 percent interception is simply ruled out. If we are talking about the opposing side beginning deployment of offensive systems in a spirit of competition between both defensive and offensive systems, it was precisely this danger that led to both sides sitting down amicably in 1972 and signing the antimissile defense limitation treaty.

[Arbatov] At the time, however, it was the Americans who urged us: Understand that offensive arms cannot be reduced or limited if you are vague about defensive arms. They managed to persuade us easily and quickly. We understood this.

[Sagdeyev] As a matter of fact, they now appeal to us -- these are different Americans, these are SDI advocates -- and say: How is it that you have forgotten the wonderful ideas with which your leaders came to the United States -- it was near the end of 1967 -- that defense is humanitarian and moral? This occured in a television dispute with one of the ideologues of Star Wars, General Daniel graham, and I had to say: You are depicting us Marxists as dogmatists. Now, who in fact is a dogmatist in this particular case?

Now, why do we nevertheless consider that SDI represents a great danger? It is because SDI, besides this unrealizable dream, contains a whole collection of the most diverse components, new technical innovations, Besides, there is a mass approach to it.

[Arbatov interrupts] It does not contain this yet, but may contain it (? if work continues).

[Sagdeyev] It may contain this and may serve as a conduit to a great variety of spheres of military technology. If we say: Let us sit down and sign an agreement eliminating nuclear arms, while, in response, we get proposals to transfer the arms race, the technological and political arms race at the same time to some new dimension, then, of course, this is unacceptable, not only to us, but to any person who takes a sober look at how mankind can enter into a new and secure world.

[Arbatov] If I have understood you correctly, Roald Zinnurovich, if we translate this into political language, then one can say that, currently, we are at a kind of crossroads. Currently, a path is being proposed and we have made progress along this path in Reykjavik. We have taken a glance into the future, to where this path leads, and this is a path to disarmament. Now, a nuclear-free world is only a beginning, but we also have in mind conventional and chemical arms, and we understand that these things are interrelated.

Now, instead of this, we are offered a new spiral in the arms race: We shall simply get rid of weapons that are obsolete or will become obsolete soon, so to speak, and enter a new spiral in the arms race connected with SDI, which is completely full of unknown and unpredictable dangers, and which ex extremely unstable and fraught with great shocks and catastrophes. This...

[Sagdeyev interrupts] It sounds something like this. Instead of beating swords into plowshares, let us beat swords into some kind of new type of weapon. [ZORIN] Roald Zinnurovich, you, a prominent scientist and specialist, say that the idea the White House boss cherishes is unrealistic from a scientific and technical point of view. Many of your very prominent colleagues in the United States are saying the same thing.

So, the question arises: Why does this idea exist, and not only exist, but is being implemented? Is not the world of the specialist in this case of sufficient gravity for the political leaders?

[Sagdeyev] I recall that, some time ago, a group of specialists, scientists, and industrial specialists sat down and, on the instructions of a major international organization -- I mean the Papal Academy of Sciences in the Vatican -- was to draw up a memorandum, an assessment of the danger of, and the prospects of, SDI. Many arguments were proposed. As an addendum to the argument about the scientific and technical impracticability of the ideal version, versions of an economic nature were proposed. They noted that SDI, in its pure form, in confrontation with offensive arms lost out economically to the order of 20 to 30 times. And at this moment...

[Arbatov interrupts] In other words, to overcome SDI, 20 to 30 times less needs to be spent.

[Sagdeyev] Yes, in order to overcome SDI with the aid of asymmetrical measures, with the aid of further development and perfection of offensive arms, in order to overcome this potential defense in space, it will be sufficient to spend only a percentage of the funds that will have to be spent for deploying SDI. And at that moment, as one of the conference participants, the vice president of a fairly large U.S. corporation working on defense department contracts, said: As soon as you Russians begin to work on the same thing -- SDI -- all of these economic arguments will immediately lose their value.

[Arbatov] That is another SDI that many Americans also have on their minds. SDI as a tool with which they want to undermine the economy of the Soviet Union, to destroy us economically, so to speak, by imposing on us this new spiral of the arms race.

[Zorin interrupts] It is perfectly clear that it is not all that easy for the U.S. economy to do as somebody wishes. Well ....

[Arbatov interrupts] Concerning the cost of SDI -- Roald Zinnurovich will correct me if I am wrong -- the minimal estimate I have seen is $700 billion. Another estimate is $3 trillion.

[Sagdeyev] All these estimates, minimum and maximum, have been made on the assumption that the potential enemy will simply sleep and wait. If the matter goes to the development of counter-measures, to the asymmetrical approach, then the upper limit will no longer exist. It will go to infinity because SDI will simply become impossible.

[Arbatov] That means that you can ruin anybody.

[Zorin] Roald Zinnurovich, you have spoken about asymmetric measures that are kept in mind. Is it possible to understand that we are not at all inclined and must not build the same kind of umbrella and follow the path that the supporters of the idea of Star Wars in its present form would like us to follow?

[Sagdeyev] I would say that to follow the same path, an asymmetric path, is a path not only connected with huge economic and material expenditures. It is also a path that is dangerous from the point of view of maintaining strategic stability. The new type of strategic balance, in which elements of both offensive and defensive weapons will coexist simultaneously, is very unstable.

One of the options -- a scenario that could develop, a catastrophic scenario -- is that one of the sides can and has in principle the technical capability to knock out its opposite, its double in space -- the defensive system of the opposite side -- with a sudden sneak strike and thus retain a more favorable strategic position for itself.

But there are also other options, an option where SDI would turn out to be completely unnecessary. In this option all strategic nuclear arms would be completely eliminated. Even in the minimal form on which the current administration has been insisting during the last few weeks, even in the option calling for the reduction of only strategic ballistic missiles, SDI becomes senseless...

[Arbatov interrupts] It is all the more unnecessary as it is intended against ballistic missiles only.

[Sagdeyev] Of course, yes. SDI becomes...

[Arbatov interrupts] It is useless against both cruise missiles and aircraft.

[Sagdeyev] And the arguments being used by the current administration in order to defend SDI in this case too, I would say, they are simply curious.

[Zorin] I would like to come to the same question from another angle, and formulate it as follows: Among the arguments used by Star Wars program advocates there is this one: The Soviet Union is coming out so insistently against SDI because it is not in a position to counter this program with something adequate. It cannot compete with the United States on an equal footing, particularly in the scientific and technological fields. What would you say to this, Roald Zinnurovich?

[Sagdeyev] I think that if there will be a need for countermeasures, if the situation with the development of the SDI program takes an irreversible character, our response has already been given by Mikhail Sergeyevich Gorbachev. The response will be asymmetrical. And I think...

[Arbatov interrupts] The answer will not be our own SDI, not a mirror image, but countermeasures.

[Sagdeyev] Not our own SDI, but countermeasures. There is a firmly large number of possible countermeasures. There are countermeasures for every SDI option. It is early to go into details today because ...

[Arbatov interrupts] And there is no need to. What for? So that they can take them into consideration? and they are all considerably cheaper, and technologically simpler, as far as I understand.

[Sagdeyev] Absolutely.

[Arbatov] Summing up our discussion on SDI, it can be said that SDI is an illusion, and speaking plainly it is a sham defense, claiming the form of an invulnerable shield against a nuclear strike. Yet SDI is dangerous for two reasons. First, it hinders agreement on a radical reduction of nuclear arms.

That means that it is a torpedo launched against the entire process of arms limitations and talks. Secondly, the SDI is a new spiral, it is the concentration of unprecedented funds on the development of military technology that will signify a new development of various kinds of arms, a new spiral in the arms race. Am I correct?

[Sagdeyev] Yes. I think that I can only add to this that the assent stated by the U.S. Administration in Reykjavik to switch over to a 100 percent reduction of nuclear arms, the elimination of strategic nuclear missiles, makes the SDI simply unnecessary. It is absurd to have such a shield, a shield against whom? Even if you examine some concrete nuances of the SDI and its separate components, it becomes clear that the desire to preserve as some kind of guarantee an SDI option that provides for the use of nuclear-pumped x-ray lasers signifies a direct violation of this potential agreement on the exclusion of strategic nuclear missiles.

What is the x-ray laser componenet of SDI? It is submarines carrying special missiles with very short acceleration times. These missiles, on receipt of signals coming, let us say, from the early warning system, could be launched to an altitutde of about 1,000 km and deploy an x-ray laser unit pumped by a nuclear explosion. That means that a warhead is needed. Thus it turns out that nuclear missiles, nuclear warheads...

[Arbatov] Identical to strategic ones.

[Sagdeyev] Yes... will be the guarantee against any of the sides violating the agreement on the complete elimination of strategic nuclear missiles. Moreover, they are even more dangerous because in the technical aspect they have a short acceleration time. They can be directed to practically any point, and exploded not only in space for pumping the x-ray lasers but also on land, on the territory of a potential enemy.

[Arbatov] Roald Zinnurovich, excuse me. I would like to ask you a question as a specialist. The very idea of this pop up, as it is called in English, these missiles that leap out and the explosions, what is the life of such a laser? It explodes and powers the laser. So what is its duration?

[Sagdeyev] It is a momentary action. It literally lasts a millionth of a second, and it is supposed that during this one millionth of a second the laser must momentarily fire and hit a missile in its launch phase.

[Arbatov] And if the missiles come with some small interval? Apparently this is also a very doubtful weapon.

[Sagdeyev] There are many methods for countering this option. Nevertheless, this SDI option, the beloved brainchild of Edward Teller, is making intensive headway. And we know from publications that several hundred million dollars have been spent on this SDI option alone.

[Zorin] Apparently feeling the weakness of his position in this regard and the potential danger concerning public opinion in this respect, President Reagan, during the electoral campaign that has just closed in the United States, tried to make the 4 November election look like a kind of referendum on U.S. foreign policy, in particular on the SDI issue. Speaking in the White House on 5 November, the day after the elections, the President said that he views the outcome of the elections as support for his military policy and, as he said, especially for SDI.

[Arbatov] Well, I would say of course, that it is a risky statement. First of all, in U.S. history the midterm elections have practically never focused around some foreign policy problem. They are elections for congressmen and one-third of the senators. They focus on local issues and the struggle over the personalities of the candidates. For this reason it was very unusual, it was a kind of violation of tradition for the President to try to make the foreign policy issue the key topic in the elections. The voters were far more concerned with the disastrous position of the farmers, unemployment, and in general with the economic difficulties, connected with a worsening of social problems, than with SDI, considerably more so.

Another point is that most of the problems that really concerned the voters are nonetheless in one way or another connected to foreign policy and especially with huge military spending; this is now being understood in the United States. I think that this is a very important point in these elections. So in this respect there may actually have been some kind of plebiscite. And it ended not at all in favor of the arms race and not in favor of SDI.

I have the impression that the Americans are now listening. They are monitoring the first underground tremors. Not all of them even know that the United States has become a debtor nation, that by 1990 its national debt to foreigners alone, not to mention the domestic debt, will rise to the fantastic sum of $500 billion. They feel and sense the alarm and begin to understand that this feigned optimism of the administration, when it speaks about the economy and other matters, contains a lot of false, hypocritical, and dishonest things. They feel that they are being deceived. And they are being deceived skillfully -- this cannot be denied -- and successfully in some things. Take SDI, for example. Many people in America really hope and believe in it. People want to believe; in the face of such horror as that of nuclear war, they want to believe in something.

[Zorin interrupts] To believe that it is possible to find shelter.

[Arbatov] To believe that it is possible to find shelter. By the way, they are not being told the truth. The government is deceiving them, deceiving them about it being in a position to protect them from a nuclear strike; that SDI will produce some kind of great attainments in the scientific and technical field; or that the only possibility for protecting oneself from a nuclear strike is the elimination of nuclear arms. And in the scientific and technical field, SDI leads not to progress but, on the contrary, to difficulties and stagnation.

[Sagdeyev] Just now in the United States, we asked the question of where is the so-called spinoff, the beginning of applications in the civilian industry? I was given two examples. One example is connected with the use of a very small battery in heart pacemaker units being implanted into the human body. In the process of improving this small battery, in the process of manufacturing smaller and smaller minature versions, it turns out that the Maxwell Laboratories company had to build huge capacitors, capacitor batteries for accelerating a projectile with the aid of a so-called rain gun.

I know this company well, I know how it was founded many years ago. I have many colleagues working there, and I know that these jobs had no relation at all to the SDI program. They were started considerably earlier. I think that only a completely illiterate simpleton can be convinced that gigantic capacitor batteries are needed in order to be able to implant a microscopic low-power battery into a human body.

[Arbatov] Roald Zinnurovich, you must have heard more frequently than I from American specialists the conclusion that research in the military field and especially in the SDI field has gone into such spheres that a return for the civilian economy cannot be expected for at least a few decades. On the contrary, great harm is now being done to both the civilian economy and science because of the massive brain drain. A drain of the best brains, research capabilities, and research potentials from constructive spheres is going into areas connected with SDI, which are fruitless for society.

The results of this militarization of U.S. science are already evident. The United States is very proud of its scientific and technical level, and I would say justly so. The American have made many achievements. But look at what has been happening in the last few years. A separate analysis has been made in the United States of the trade in high technology goods, including computers, instruments, communications equipment, aerospace industry products -- the very apex of science. It turns out that in 1980 Americans sold $27 billion more of these products than they bought. Last year it was only $4 billion more than they bought. And this year they will sell $2 billion less than they will purchase abroad.

That means that they are being beaten by competitors in this field, and they are being beaten primarily because the United States has carried out such a bloodletting of its scientific and technical potential to military fields, including SDI. This did not go unpunished and now it has to be paid for. And by the way, this is the reason Amercians are so inistently pulling their competitors into SDI.

[Arbatov continues] In England, for example, I was told that there are about 100 people there, the most intelligent and promising people, who are receiving salaries simply so that they can run around universities and various companies and purchase at the source. We are talking about the most advanced areas of scientific and technical progress: computers, lasers, new materials, optics -- all of these spheres. In Japan they are totally convinced that the SDI was invented not so much as a threat against the Soviet Union, but as a way to dispose of the Japanese high technology industry once and for all.

[Zorin] If we return to the elections so as to end this topic, I wish to say that I agree that economic -- including not only immediate ones but future ones too, about which you spoke -- have played a decisive role. Nvertheless, it is a fact that a whole series of people personally close to Reagan, who are known as ardent supporters of the Star Wars program, have suffered defeat at these elections, even those candidates who received direct support from the President. Paula Hawkins, for example, in Florida. He spoke there on several occasions, and supported here as an advocate of Star Wars. She lost to a person known as an opponent of Star Wars. So then is situation also ...

[Arbatov interrupts] At the very least this speaks of the of fact that Star Wars did not become a trump card . . .

[Zorin interrupts] A trump card.

[Arbatov] A trump card, and it did not bring in extra votes. This is at the very least. I want to note that Americans, as a rule, have no ideas what the Star Wars program is. Nevertheless the administration succeeded in fooling the average American. Among scientists the situation is different. What do they think at the American Academy of Sciences.

[Sagdeyev] Well, I can say that recently a very curious opinion poll of the U.S. National Academy of Sciences was taken. Several hundred scientists were polled, 540 of these agreed to participate in the poll and answered all the questions. Only 20 people, that is 4 percent of the scientists, said that perhaps SDI is possible.

[Arbatov] Well, you see. It is unfortunate that today there is a difference between the opinions of the educated people and those who take all their knowledge from the mass information media which give the official version.

[Zorin] I wish to touch on another problem in direct relation to our talk today. The U.S. press reports that the United States is about to commission the 131st B-52 bomber armed with cruise missiles. This means an open and direct violation of the SALT-II Treaty, since it exceeds the levels allowed by this treaty. In this way Washington is throwing away one of the most important agreements of the postwar period, an agreement that somehow regulated the process of the arms race and held this process in check. And what is particularly noteworthy and significant is that it is taking place just a few weeks after President Reagan at Reykjavik gave his consent to far-reaching steps directed at ending the nuclear arms race and liquidating nuclear arsenals. How can this be reconciled?

[Arbatov] It cannot be reconciled. It just does not work. But at the same time I think it is a very significant and revealing page of current political life. You see, on the one hand, the fact that it is possible to reduce weapons, all strategic weapons, by 50 percent is not even being argued in the United States. There are only questions of details. How to take into account cruise missiles on submarines and some other details, but in principle there is no argument. Behind this, of course, among other things is the understanding that a huge amount of weapons has been stockpiled, that such quantities are even in some way superfluous, not only for a rational goal -- a rational nuclear goal is impossible -- but even for a rational goal they are not needed.

Nevertheless, they wish to exceed the elementary quantitative level. Why? In my opinion this is very significant. It is not just the bomber armed with 20 cruise missiles that is important. What is important is to break the SALT-II Treaty itself. By the way, this speaks of the uncertainty of the people who are presently in power in the United States. They want to use Reagan's personal prestige and his popularity, his closeness to the military-industrial complex and the fact that he cannot resist the temptation to speed up the arms race, to now break all existing treaties. First the SALT-II treaty, then the antimissile treaty; following which -- if there will be this nuclear pumped [laser] -- the treaty prohibiting nuclear weapons in space -- a treaty like this also exists.

This also includes, of you like, relations with international organizations and international law. These people do not want any constraints. They now want, they set the following aims: these are cynical people. Their aim is to leave scorched earth after themselves, a desert, in the sense of limiting the arms race, in the sense, even, if you wish, of international law, some form of order, some elementary guarantees of security, so that they have a completely free hand to do whatever they want on a global scale.

[Zorin] And to tie the next administration, no matter what it is, to what will be done now.

[Arbatov] Yes, it is easier to dismantle than to build.

[Zorin] In conclusion, a question on how you imagine the development, under present conditions, considering what we have been saying, of the political process for the forthcoming period.

[Sagdeyev] Reykjavik has shown completely new prospects, new possibilities. Only a year ago it would have been hard to imagine that there would have been anyone in the U.S. Administration who would have agreed to specifically discuss a program of such meaningful reductions, even the total liquidation of strategic nuclear arms. It would have been even more difficult to imagine such specific talks, such specific discussions 4 years ago, when our country was declared the center of evil. And these new strategic configurations -- in the initial stages this is a 50 percent reduction and in the future, the gradual abandonment of various components of nuclear weapons up to their complete liquidation -- are very new and important food for thought and for analyses at various scientific organizations, in the circles of so-called concerned scientists, and by military strategists.

I think that all these processes will have their place and the pace will pick up, and finally, I think that politicians will have to react to this, including politicians on Capitol Hill, and politicians in the present and perhaps future U.S. Administrations.

[Arbatov] Since you have touched on the United States, I would be inclined to say that we are now standing at the threshold of very interesting developments in the political life of this country, developments connected with that unusual situation -- which has happened before, but is nevertheless unusual -- when both houses of the Congress have an opposition majority. I think that these years will bring about a series of interesting changes and new phenomena in the American economy and in American relations with its allies. So this struggle which will continue around Reykjavik, is now very important. Efforts are now being made to pull back, even though we managed with difficulty to climb to this peak, to Reykjavik. And efforts are being made to pull things back to the starting point. Now the struggle is centered around preventing this; on the contrary, to ensure the possibility of a forward movement to ever loftier heights, and to implement what was discussed in Reykjavik.

Strictly speaking, in Geneva we proposed specific negotiable positions that precisely and strictly set out concrete proposals on which agreement was reached in Reykjavik. I would add even more. It follows that in the proposals that were tabled in Geneva, attempts are made to find some sort of keys to open the last doors that were closed in Reykjavik on the path to agreement.

Besides, I wish to say, that we have by necessity paid a great deal of attention to Soviet-U.S. relations. But if we speak of the future, and even about today, it is very important for us to understand that the world is more than the United States and that our foreign relations are not reduced to Soviet-American relations. We have many other, no less important tasks. Recently, a very important meeting of the leaders of the communist and workers parties of socialist countries came to an end. This was a most important meeting for our foreign policies and very important decisions were made there. Many new actions and initiatives are in the works, both in the Asian direction of our foreign policy and in the European direction, and we will undoubtedly hear about them soon. This long overdue period, of very important and very fruitful diplomatic activity of the Soviet Union, which distinguished the last year and a half, will, I am certain, continue.

[Zorin] Well, our time on the air has elapsed. It remains for me to thank you for participating in our talk today and to thank our television viewers for their attention. And so, until we meet again here in our Studio 9, all the best.

Falin Interview on Reykjavik

AU141041 Warsaw TRYBUNA LUDU in Polish 10 Nov 86 p 5

[Interview given by Valentin Falin, chairman of the NOVOSTI press agency, to Jerzy Kraszewski, TRYBUNA LUDU moscow correspondent: "Reykjavik 30 Days on -- The Opportunity Is Still There" -- in Moscow, date not given]

[Text] Valentin Falin, the noted Soviet diplomat, political and press activist, and chairman of the NOVOSTI press agency board, received Jerzy Kraszewski, head of the TRYBUNA LUDU Moscow bureau, and talked with him about some international issues in the light of the results of the M. Gorbachev and R. Reagan meeting. V. Falentin was one of CPSU General Secretary M. Gorbachev's experts during the Reykjavik trip.

[Kraszewski] The futher we move away from Reykjavik, the more heated the world discussions about the results, open difficulties, and problems of the Reykjavik meeting become. At the same time, Washington continues to distort the essence of the Soviet initiatives and to give a false picture of the course of the meeting. A campaign of disinformation and of falsifying the essence of the talks is still continuing in the United States....

That is why I propose that we should turn to the night of 11-12 October. To recapitulate: Following the first day of the talks between M. Gorbachev and R. Reagan, two groups of Soviet and U.S. experts began their work, which was reported to have continued from 2000 until 0430 the next day. What did you work on and what really happened during that session?

[Falin] The experts were asked to draw up a concrete accord on the strength of the M. Gorbachev-R. Reagan exchanges of views and the proposals submitted during the first meeting on 11 October. That is why the question asked by Marshal Akhromeyev, who led our group, was simple and specific: What is the American side able to say about Gorbachev's proposals put forward during his meeting with Reagan? Our proposals were submitted in writing -- in Russian and English. The Work of Experts [subhead] [position of subhead as published]

The marshal asked this question, which was followed by a long and wearisome silence. He repeated the question and suggested that the session should concretely examine the Soviet formulations -- sentence by sentence and word by word. Unfortunately, a constructive and positive response, which we expected from the U.S. side, did not materialize. Nitze, Rovny, Kampelman, Edelman, Perle, and others asked for an adjournment.

Although our American colleagues did promise that their consultations would be short, the adjournment was very long. When they returned they handed us a sheet of paper with a message, which we examined and concluded there was nothing new in. The marshal asked whether the U.S. representatives were able to tell what was new in the U.S. counterproposal in relation to the position assumed by the United States at Geneva negotiations on 18 September. The USSR had replied to this earlier.

There was another pause. After a while an embarrased Paul Nitze declared that their counterproposal did not contain anything new and was really a repetition of the 18 September position.

The marshal then recalled that we had been instructed by our leadership not to discuss the proposals that had already been examined in Geneva and on which views had previously been aired.

We were instructed to prepare joint working documents, worked out by the two groups of experts. We had to adopt the 11 October exchange of views between the two leaders as a point of departure for these proposals.

Our American colleagues then gave us to understand that they were not ready to examine the issues in this way. In this situation the Soviet experts proposed that we should adjourn and inform M. Gorbachev and R. Reagan about the new situation. Our proposal was accepted.

We met again at 0300 and we noted that the conduct of the U.S. delegates was a little different. They agreed to open a specific discussion of the text and formulation of the materials under preparation. As a result of this discussion and exchanges of view and, not without difficulties and disputes, including disputes within the U.S. delegation itself, a draft accord was produced on the elimination of strategic weapons in two phases within 10 years.

It was proposed to reduce the strategic carriers of nuclear weapons and nuclear warheads by 50 percent in the first phase and to eliminate all nuclear weapons [bron] in Europe in the first phase, that is, in the first 5-year period. This was that we proposed, but the American insisted that the "zero alternative" should also be applied to the Soviet medium-range missiles [rakiety] in Asia. We said that we could not agree to such a concept, but in the end the two sides agreed to submit the issue of medium-range missiles [rakiety] in Asia to Delegation Chairmen Gorbachev and Reagan.

The issue of verification [kontrola] was a very difficult aspect of our work. We insisted on accepting the principle of triple verification: through national resources, supranational resources, and on-site inspection. The Americans, especially Perle, had doubts about on-site inspection with regard to many specific kinds of weapons, primarily sea-based missiles. We could not agree with them. Motivated by the principles of equality, we argued that on-site inspection must cover all kinds of weapons, including the systems to which the Americans attach special significance for various reasons.

We then discussed the issue of halting nuclear tests. The examination of this issue began from two different poles, if I may say so. The Americans proposed to prepare an accord on the conditions under which explosions would be continued, but rejecting their concept we declared that in line with the two sides' international obligations we insist on drawing up an accord on wholly and completely halting all tests.

In the end, showing great resistance and unwillingness, the Americans conceded such a possibility and our discussion began to revolve around a gradual halting of tests. We agreed that the power of explosions would be gradually lowered and that other restrictions would be introduced. However, all this would be done under the provision that, within a definite, measurable, and specific time, the sides would sign an accord on wholly halting nuclear tests.

Finally, the issue of the absolute observance of the accord on restricting the systems of antimissile defense produced differences that could not be overcome. The Americans adopted an interpretation of the accord that would ultimately reduce the accord to naught. In fact we are asked to participate in the elimination and demolition of this accord. The Americans argued that it was actually obsolete and inconsistent with the present situation.

In this connection they revoked point "D" of the protocol and the right of the United States to terminate the accord. That is why Marshal Akhromeyev pointed to the fact that our partners had falsified the substance of the protocol and that they wanted to apply point "D" to Article 5, although it was Article 3 that was involved. As for Article 5, it simply forbids any work that exceeds the framework of permitted actions, that is, the operation of a restricted number of antimissile defense systems in a single region on earth and only on earth. Article 5 forbids installing, creating, and testing the systems and components of weapons using mobile sea, air, and space bases.

The U.S. representatives did not question this reservation, but they argued that their views were different. We agreed to report to our leaderships on the situation that developed. And this was in principle the conclusion of everything.

I repeat: We achieved considerable progress. In fact we were able to formulate conditions for eliminating nuclear weapons in two stages. In the first 5 years we would reduce all systems of offensive strategic weapons by 50 percent and wholly eliminate them by the end of the 10-year period. Other issues remain partly open -- the issue of medium-range missiles in Asia and the issue of the accord on restricting the antimissile defense systems. The United States refuses to fulfill its obligations stemming from this accord.

Two Sides of the Same Coin [subhead]

[Kraszewski] I take the following view of what you have just said: The U.S. side was taken aback by the scale and unusual nature of the Soviet proposals. The U.S. side was not ready for serious discussions. How can this be explained? Why did President Reagan come to Reykjavik empty-handed? What did he count on? What principles is he now following when he ascribes to himself his own initiatives and those that are not his?

[Falin] All this is most complicated, you know. Of course, the U.S. President came to Reykjavik empty-handed insofar as constructive, wide-ranging initiatives and a qualitative breakthrough in disarmament negotiations are concerned. It could be that, believing in various rumors and reports supplied by various U.S. agencies, he thought that we would be satisfied with some partial and intermediate settlements, with some cosmetic actions, or with some temporary accord in order to keep alive the feeble embers of dialogue....

Of course, the President was not psychologically prepared to decide on a radical change in the situation and in the very method of negotiations. He was not prepared to turn away from the nuclear world to a non-nuclear one within the specified deadline of 10 years, to erect barriers to the arms race in new areas, and to halt the present dangerous development of the situation.

On the other hand, as a man and president and, especially as the leader of the U.S. governing faction, prior to elections he did not want to appear in an unfavorable light and be regarded as a politician whose appraisal of prospects was not quite correct or was quite incorrect. Judging by many post-Reykjavik events, it is apparent that his tactic involved the following concept: To achieve an accord on the strength of the Soviet proposals on eliminating nuclear weapons and then "put aside" everything, confront this accord with the SDI program, and put forward the "Strategic Defense Initiative" as an initial condition for Soviet agreement to demolish the accord on restricting the antimissile defense systems and as a premise for achieving some measure of progress in some other areas, if theoretically at all possible.

From the viewpoint of disarmament issues and the methods of negotiations all this is completely illogical. Every reasonable human being realizes that it is impossible to count on progress in disarmament by demolishing what was previously achieved in this regard and what is one of the sine qua non conditions for continuing the process of disarmament.

Attempts were made to turn unfaithfulness to one accord into an invitation to conclude another.... They want to sacrifice the interminable accord on restricting the antimissile defense systems to definite ambitious plans, saying in this connection that the United States is a good partner for some future settlements....

And what if our conduct were like that? The United States would and should have rejected it, if it stuck to a logical line on preserving and strengthening the norms of international law. It is a fact that only on the basis of these norms is it possible to create normal and stable relations among states.

It goes without saying that the Soviet side had to reject the U.S. concepts. It could not help rejecting them. Otherwise we would have betrayed principles. I wish to stress clearly that from the very beginning -- from the moment when the 1972 accord on restricting the antimissile defense systems was negotiated and signed -- the sides were aware that there was a mutual link between restricting the arms race on earth and preventing such a race in other spheres. There is a mutual connection between restricting strategic offensive weapons and restriting strategic defense weapons. These are the two sides of the same coin. Severing this connection would amount to incapacitating both restrictions. In such a case there would follow an unrestricted offensive arms race and, correspondingly, an unrestricted arms race in those areas that we formally call defensive.

Why is the U.S. President now ascribing to himself other people's initiatives and ideas? Let us be more specific and say "some of the other people's initiatives and ideas," because he is far from wholly ascribing them to himself. What he is doing is merely fishing out from other people's proposals and initiatives only that which he is able to present to the American people in an attractive way. It is most probable that this is a result of the domestic peculiarities of the U.S. situation and of the recent elections. You have to put a good face on a bad game....

The Historic Dimension of the Soviet Proposals [subhead]

[Kraszewski] How do you appraise the world's response to the results of the Reykjavik meeting?

[Falin] I think that the general response, the response of the majority, shows that people are aware that a constructive and positive breakthrough could have been achieved in Reykjavik, that there were conditions for such a breakthrough, that the Soviet proposals are of truly historic dimensions, and that they created opportunities that could ensure a further development of civilization on stable foundations and guarantee clear and transparent prospects.

People are also convinced that Reagan has sacrificed this opportunity on the altar of the U.S. militaristic plans. And if the minority, that is, the governments of countries that are closest to the United States or rather the NATO political groups that are closest to the White House (Thatcher, the Kohl government) approve of the Reagan stand, then theirs is not a genuine homage but a homage to the narrow and coldly calculated interests that link the imperialist countries within the aggressive NATO bloc. Of course, as world public opinion polls and other facts indicate, these positions of the governing circles are in conflict with the views of most peoples, even of those in the NATO countries.

[Kraszewski] However, some Western circles pose this question at times: Could not the USSR take yet another step and agree to the American alternative? I mean SDI. Why is it so dangerous? What are the dangers involved in this program? Another question indirectly connected with this issue: How would you appraise the post-Reykjavik course of the present round of Soviet-American negotiations in Geneva?

[Falin] All compromises have their limits. Wherever principles are violated a possiblity for compromise no longer exists. The United States did not seek a compromise. What it wanted was for the other side to capitulate before the unreasonable and extremely dangerous U.S. demands. I have in mind the demand to demolish the accord on restricting the antimissle defense systems and to start an arms race in space.

But the facts are: If we want to end the arms race on earth we cannot permit the arms race to be transferred to this space. If we do not want to prevent an arms race in space, this means that we want to step up the arms race on earth. This is the only way in which the issue can be viewed. That is why Gorbachev told Reagan the following: The Soviet Union cannot countenance doing away with the treaty on limiting antimissile defense systems, and will not take part in the process. If the Americans want to assume responsibility for destroying a treaty that is the cornerstone of the entire disarmament process that is their affair. The Soviet Union will not be their partner in this.

Why does the so-called Strategic Defense Initiative pose a danger? Because SDI is not a defensive system, it is not even a antimissile defense system. SDI is an attempt to make the arms race enter a qualitatively new phase. It is an attempt to create a weapons system based on new principles in physics, a weapons system whose scale and consequences are comparable to those of nuclear weapons. One can say that it is an attempt to find a way out of the blind alley in which the world finds itself at the present time with the help of even more dangerous weapons, weapons that are even more treacherous. The Union States believes that this weapons will provide it with military superiority, at least at some point in its development. They wish to exploit this possible superiority in a struggle with the socialist countries.

The world, all of us, face a choice at the present time: Should we permit such a course of events to take place or not? Should we allow mankind to be exposed to a new danger and become even more dependent on military technology than at present?

The system we are talking about is meant to operate so quickly that a human being will not have an opportunity to make a conscious decision when a danger arises. Control of the arms race, even in theory, will not be possible. It will not be a question of there being hours or minutes to make a decision, but seconds. There are no geniuses or wise men who would find those few seconds sufficient time to reach a decision.

And that is where the root of the entire danger lies. SDI is a label, the packaging for other objectives. Besides, this has been the case in the past. Can one mention at least one postwar American strategy that was not called "defensive" in U.S. terminology? The planned elimination of socialism and communism throughout the world was also called "defensive." In this sense, nothing has changed. The directives for the development of the American Armed Forces formulated by the Pentagon in May 1982 set everything out plainly, in black and white. The aim of the arms race in space is to divest all the defense investments of socialist countries of their value -- investments made over decades -- and to compel the USSR and other socialist countries to embark on an arms race in spheres that we find uncomfortable.

As M. Gorbachev said: We are in a position to respond to these "uncomfortable spheres" by applying far more economical and effective solutions. If SDI takes the form of a weapons system that orbits the earth, we will be able to put it out of action by using only a small part of the resources that the Americans will have to expend in order to build themselves a system of this kind.

However, the technologies developed to meet the needs of the program will remain. It will not be possible to render these technologies harmless. Once they have been created, technologies live, exist. The spreading of these technologies throughout the world will make the fate of civilization rest on whether an unfortunate accident takes place or not. When one considers prospects for the future, this is precisely what needs to be clearly borne in mind.

The Geneva Negotiations [subhead]

And now for your question about the course of the Geneva negotiations.

Our position, which was formulated by the CPSU Central Committee general secretary, is as follows: The Soviet proposals are on the table. We believe that the only correct way forward is one that starts from the point reached at Reykjavik. Reykjavik brought us to a point at which it was already possible to issue ministers with concrete directives and to establish real principle for agreements for the elimination of nuclear weapons over the course of the next 10 years.

The Soviet side would, of course, like to assume that the Americans will go forward, and that they will not start to back out. Unfortunately, there is no certainty that they will behave this way. More than that, the facts attest to the outcome being quite the opposite.

[Kraszewski] The following doubts emerged during the course of discussion on the results produced by the Reykjavik meeting: Is it not the case that the USSR is going too far in the compromises that it is prepared to make? Will concessions not weaken the security of the USSR and its allies? What is your view of these doubts?

The compromises discussed at Reykjavik do, of course, carry a certain risk. If there was a danger that the American side would not accept the obligations that it might undertake then the USSR and its allies would be faced with certain complications. This might prove to be the case if only because, as you know, the nuclear forces of France and England would not be covered by the first stage of a possible settlement.

But it is certainly true that the compromise discussed at Reykjavik does have a foundation, a basis that is fully justified, and that it also suits the new stage in political development and the development of military technology. However, it does rest on one condition: that a U.S. decision on radical reductions in nuclear arms followed by the complete abandonment of such weapons will be serious and lasting, and on condition that the situation that arose 10 years ago does not repeat itself. The United States promised that it wanted detente and peaceful coexistence but later proceeded, in effect, to back out of these promises. If one accepts that in theory such a reversal in American policy is possible, than I am prepared to agree with the fears that you have expressed. Compromises do conceal a risk.

But if at the very outset we assume that the other side will not observe treaties and other possible agreements, then it is best not to start negotiations at all. We want to believe that the United States can and ought to be a reliable partner because in the final analysis this also lies in its interests.

"Can one believe President Reagan at all? He said one thing in Reykjavik and then something entirely different when he returned to Washington." This question was posed in" letter sent to the editors of SOVETSKAYA ROSSIYA by a reader in Irkutsk. He is not the only one to have such misgivings.

What Next? [subhead]

[Kraszewski] I realize that it is difficult to make predictions at the present time but I would like to end our conversation by asking a question: "What next? Is there a chance that an agreement that would pave the way to complete nuclear disarmament can be concluded with the present administration? Are you, personally, an optimist or a pessimist?

[Falin] It is understandable that trust in the American Administration has not grown in Moscow after what we have been witnessing in the United States, these downright attempts to "rectify" Reykjavik, to call white black, black white. I think it is doubtful whether people in the United States believe Reagan more today than yesterday. Probably not. The President and his ministers cannot strengthen people's trust in them if what they say today is different from what they said yesterday; if tomorrow they deny what they say today; if commentaries from Speakes and others are necessary to clarify the essence of the ambiguous words that Reagan uses; and if no one at all knows what is going to happen next.

However, there is one big "but." It is not we who determine the election of American presidents, senators, and members of the House of Representatives. Elections are held in accordance with the principles that obtain in the United States, principles that it is customary to call democratic. These principles produce an unstable mechanism of government marked by policy inconsistencies and unpredictable actions, which are a burden for the entire world community. However, we have no other partners.

Should we wait until someone wiser appears or until this President comes to his senses? We can. But time flies and time is not neutral. New weapons systems appear, stockpiles of old weapons grow, and new dangers and problems which are increasingly difficult to resolve accumulate. Thus, there is only one way out: We must try again and again to convince the leadership, the society, and the United States Congress that rejecting the offer of cooperation from the socialist states does not lie in their interests.

We must try to convince them that it is no longer possible to create a security system exclusively for the United States, one that is based on threatening others. Today, security can only be a common and universal matter. We must convince them that it is not possible to solve security problems by employing military means, that the main problem is a political one.

Whether we succeed in this depends on the responsiveness of governing people in the United States to new, fresh ideas. It will depend on the ability of these people to use power for positive ends and to overcome what has been America's weakness for many decades -- as one American journalist wrote -- all the United States' problems stem not from imperfect muscle but from imperfect reason.

One should be neither an optimist nor a pessimist, but a sober realist. One should not allow the opportunity that exists to pass us by, and one should not see things in excessively dark colors, even when the actions of the United States give no grounds for being particularly optimistic...

PACT MILITARY COUNCIL MEETING RESULTS REPORTED

PM141615 Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian 15 Nov 86 Morning Edition p 5

["On the Results of a Routine Session of the Warsaw Pact Joint Armed Forces Military Council" -- IZVESTIYA headline]

[Text] A routine session of the Warsaw Pact Joint Armed Forces Military Council was held 12 through 14 November 1986 in the Romanian capital of Burcharest under the chairmanship of Marshal of the Soviet Union V.G. Kulikov, commander in chief of the Joint Armed Forces.

Military Council members and senior officials from the defense ministries of the Warsaw Pact states and Joint Armed forces' administrative organs took part in its work.

The Military Council discussed the question of the results and conclusions stemming from the meeting between M.S. Gorbachev, general secretary of the CPSU Central Committee, and U.S. President R. Reagan in Reykjavik. The allied socialist states' important contribution to safeguarding peace was noted and the need to step up joint efforts in the interests of struggling to eliminate nuclear arms and reduce conventional arms and to strengthen international security was stressed.

Specific measures were outlined for maintaining troops and naval forces on detachment from the allied armies to the Joint Armed Forces at a level ensuring that military parity between the Warsaw Pact and the NATO bloc is maintained.

The session also summed up the results of the Warsaw Pact Joint Armed Forces' operational and combat training over the last year, defined tasks for the new training year, and examined other questions of the Joint Armed Forces' current activity.

In the opinion of all the session participants the need to further expand and deepen combat collaboration among the allied armies was reaffirmed.

The Military Council adopted agreed recommendations and proposals on the questions that were discussed.

The session was held in a businesslike atmosphere and in a spirit of friendship and mutual understanding.

VIETNAM'S TRUONG CHINH DEPARTS FROM MOSCOW

LD141931 Moscow TASS in English 1719 GMT 14 Nov 86

[Text] Moscow November 14 TASS -- Truong Ching, general secretary of the Central Committee of Vietnam's Communist Party and chairman of the State Council of the Socialist Republic of Vietnam, has left Moscow today.

He attended the working meeting of the heads of the fraternal parties of the socialist member countries of the Council for Mutual Economic Assistance.

The head of the fraternal party was seen off by Vitaliy Vorotnikov, a member of the Political Bureau of the CPSU Central Commitee and chairman of the Council of Ministers of the Russian Federation.

COMMENTARY DENIES 'CONJECTURE' ON CEMA SUMMIT

LD151412 Moscow Domestic Service in Russian 0350 GMT 15 Nov 86

[Vladimir Pasko commentary]

[Text] The foreign mass media are commenting on the Moscow meeting of the leaders of the fraternal parties of the CEMA member countries. The communist and workers press stresses the great importance of the results of the meeting for accelerating the CEMA countries' progress and raising the level of their cooperation. Western radio voices, however, such as the West German station Deutsche Welle, are attempting to portray the meeting as arising out of almost some sort of emergency and are trying to find disagreement in how the participants in the meeting approached the issues under discussion. At the microphone is our commentator, Vladimir Pasko.

[Pasko] First of all I would note that the agreement to hold such meetings was reached at the CEMA economic conference back in 1984. Any talk that this latest meeting arose because of some sort of special circumstances is nothing more than conjecture. Two years ago the CEMA leaders, deeming it useful to step up the collective efforts to develop cooperation and socialist economic integration, considered it expedient, I quote, to hold top-level party and state leadership meetings to coordinate the mainline directions in the strategy of economic development and promotion of the international socialist division of labor. The cardinal problems of the development and further improvement of cooperation and possiblities for opening up more fully the creative potential of socialism were the subject of discussion at the latest working meeting in Moscow, too. The leaders of the fraternal parties paid particular attention, as you know from the statement, to the further deepening of relations in the economic sphere and the utilization of new and the most progressive forms of economic, scientific and technological cooperation. What is the thrust of this? It is a matter of restructuring the cooperation between the CEMA countries and the mechanisms of cooperation in accordance with the requirements to switch their economies on to the tracks of intensification. You will recall that in the period since the previous meeting of the CEMA leaders there have been remarkable events on that path. A comprehensive program for the scientific and technological progress of the CEMA countries was drawn up and adopted, and a start has been made on implementing it; the 5-year plans have been coordinated, taking into account the recommendations of the economic conference; and a number of major-scale, multilateral agreements along the priority lines of cooperation are being implemented.

At the same time, as practice has shown, the CEMA countries also encounter difficulties in implementing the decisions adopted. These questions were discussed at the recent CEMA meeting. The countries of the community are unanimous in the view that new forms are needed to make their economic development and cooperation dynamic. One of these chief forms today are direct links between producers and the setting up of financially autonomous joint associations, enterprises, design offices and other international collectives. But for this, as was noted at the session, the necessary conditions have to be created. In this instance these conditions are the improvement of price-setting, currency and financial relations, and legal contractual structures -- quite substantial issues, as you realize.

At their working meeting the leaders of the fraternal parties also exchanged opinions on topical international questions. That, too, is natural. The external conditions of the development of the CEMA countries remain complex: imperialism is using means of economic war against us. But the most important thing is that international tension remains.

In its attempt to achieve military superiority over the Soviet Union, the United States is transferring the arms race into space. It would be surprising if, in these conditions, questions of world politics were left out of the purview of the participants in the meeting, and of course this did not happen. What were the results of the discussion? The leaders of the fraternal parties supported the principled stance of the Soviet Union at the Reykjavik meeting. They stressed the need to intensify their joint efforts in the struggle to eliminate nuclear weapons, reduce conventional weapons, and strengthen peace and international security.

To try and find disagreements within the socialist community and, what is more, to build a policy upon this -- which is what our ideological opponents are engaged in -- is a hopeless waste of time. The West has had numerous occasions to learn this. Despite all the diversity of the conditions in which the socialist countries find themselves they are working on the solution of a common task. The joint discussion of cardinal problems enables us to advance more rapidly and overcome the difficulties more resolutely. As our party's Central Committee Politburo noted, the Moscow meeting confirmed yet again the desirability of asserting this form of cooperation among the communist and workers' parties.

SOVETSKAYA ROSSIYA ASSESSES RESULTS OF CEMA

LD131059 Moscow TASS International Service in Russian 2349 GMT 12 Nov 86

[Text] Moscow, 13 Nov (TASS) -- Objective possibilities based on the very nature of socialism, guarantee its indisputable advantage in all directions of competition between the two social systems, Leonard Kraynov, the author of the SOVETSKAYA ROSSIYA international review writes, commenting on the results of the meeting of leaders of fraternal parties of socialist CEMA member states in Moscow. But we are not only optimists, we are also realists and know very well that any possiblities and resources do not happen automatically. No matter how noticeable the economic achievements of our community are, new tasks appear every day. It is, of course, easier to solve them and to overcome difficulties jointly. by pulling resources together, exchanging experiences, implementing this experience jointly, and taking into account specific conditions of each individual country, we multiply our achievements and the strength of all world communism.

CEMA countries do not see themselves as a closed group, the review says. They are in favor of normalizing international relations in the area of economy, science, and technology, for the removal of any kind of articial obstacles, for trust among states. They speak resolutely against the arms race, militarization of space, and the preparation of thermonuclear war. In the course of the meeting, leaders of fraternal parties exchanged views on topical issues of the contemporary international situation. Having supported the principled position of the Soviet Union in Reykjavik, participants in the meeting underlined the necessity to increase joint efforts in the interests of the struggle for liquidating nuclear and reducing conventional weapons, for strengthening peace and international security.

We are convinced that such fate can be prevented. Again and again the socialist community proposes to come to an agreement on the most important problem of our days -- the existence or otherwise of human civilization. The socialist countries are in favor of dialogue, the author points out. But they do not want discussion at the negotiations table to be turned into a smokescreen concealing the arms race. Today, particularly after the Reykjavik meeting and after the United States' refusal to accept the USSR's clear and effective peace proposals, even the most politically inexperienced person will say that the strategy of the socialist countries is a strategy of peace, creation, and humanitarianism.

WEEKLY 'INTERNATIONAL OBSERVERS ROUNDTABLE'

LD161926 Moscow Domestic Service in Russian 1230 GMT 16 Nov 86

["International Observers Roundtable" program with Rudolf Georgiyevich Kolchanov, deputy editor of TRUD; Aleksandr Aleksandrovich Lebedev, member of editorial board of NOVOYE VREMYA; Aleksandr Vladimirovich Zholkver, political observer of Central Television and All-Union Radio]

[Text] [Zholkver] Hello, comrades. A major international event of the past week has been the working meeting in Moscow of leaders of the fraternal parties of the socialist member countries of CEMA. As you know, the Politburo of the Central Committee of our party noted that the positions of the CPSU set forth at the meeting are a practical expression of the priority we intend to give to the development of relations with the socialist countries and the strengthening of world socialism. It should be said that first reactions to the Moscow meeting already bear striking witness to the great interest this important event has aroused throughout the world. And I must say that interest is shown both by those who are our friends, and by those who are not. As for the latter, their voices were heard on various radio stations predicting that the Moscow meeting would run into all sorts of difficulties.

Well, once again, these prophets of doom have disgraced themselves, since the meeting passed in an atmosphere of cordiality, frankness, mutual understanding and unity on all the matters discussed. And these were, indeed, matters of the very greatest importance, concerning the cardinal problems of the development and improvement of cooperation among the socialist countries and the fuller realization of the creative potential of socialism.

Special attention was paid at the Moscow meeting to the further deepening of their relations in the economic sphere, and to the use of the most progressive new forms of economic and scientific-technical collaboration. I know, Rudolf Georgiyevich, that your paper, TRUD, writes a great deal about the various forms of that cooperation. What can you tell us about it?

[Kolchanov] From this point of view it's important to emphasize that the cooperation itself is very dynamic: it alters commensurately with the changes that occur in the state of the economy of our countries. We talk nowadays about the need to expand direct links among the enterprises of our fraternal states. You know, in principle this isn't a new problem. I remember when I was a newspaper correspondent in Czechoslovakia, in a small town in Czechoslovakia, I came across an instance -- I'm making a point of mentioning the smallness of the town, because you might say it's only a particular case. In cooperation with the Vladimir Scientific Research Institute, they had jointly developed asynchronous motors. These are not a product of the most worldwide importance, but this direct contact was such a success that they rapidly attained international parameters, were successfully launched on the international market, and, altogether, showed in this individual but concrete case how substantial and practical such ties can be. We're now entering a new stage in the development of these direct contacts, with the setting up of joint production associations or joint industrial enterprises. But you remember, colleagues, that not so long ago Comrade Ryzhkov, chairman of the Council of Ministers, signed an agreement in Poland on the establishment of the first five Soviet-Polish joint enterprises. Well, and now, after the 42d meeting of the CEMA session, the appropriate documents have been signed between the USSR and Hungary, the USSR and Bulgaria, Czechoslovakia and the GDR.

[Zholkver] Yes, I'd like to quote a few specific examples of the way this kind of direct cooperation is already taking shape and being developed. There are, for instance, the machine-tools with the trademark "I.S." which have now appeared and are beginning to enter the international market. They are made at the "Ivanovo-Sofia" production association. They are a new machine-tool with program control, and really show how, by joining scientific research potential to production potential, we can achieve not only an addition of resources, but a multiplication.

[Kolchanov] Incidentally, Aleksandr Vladimirovich, the newspapers TRUD and the Bulgarian TRUD are holding an international seminar on this very subject in Ivanovo at the end of this month. We're expecting guests from Bulgarian enterprises, and there'll be Soviet experts and also journalists. The experts will be exchanging opinions, and the journalists will write about it in our papers, Bulgarian TRUD and Soviet TRUD.

[Zholkver] Of course I'd say that to some extent this is still only the beginning. There are a lot of problems and difficulties, and I...

[Kolchanov, interrupting] ...which we'll be talking about at the seminar, of course.

[Zholkver] I saw an interview given by CSSR premier Comrade Strougal, after the CEMA session in Bucharest which you mentioned, Rudolf Georgiyevich; and he remarked that at the session, too, there was no question of passing over in silence questions connected with delays in implementing the integrated program for the scientific-technical progress of the CEMA countries; the production phase remains, as yet, a weak spot in the implementation of the objectives mapped out by the program -- so there's still a lot of work to be done. But it's gratifying, of course, that we can already point to positive results of this sort. Take, for example, the fact that as a result of the expansion and deepening of collaboration between the Soviet and Hungarian motor industries, we'll be receiving next year from Hungary 4,000 of the new Ikarus articulated urban buses. I think the inhabitants of many of our towns will be pleased about that.

[Lebedev] Aleksandr Vladimirovich, the CEMA session in Bucharest also approved a program of great importance, fundamental importance, especially in view of certain events that we all know about, namely the program for the building of atomic electric power stations and heat supply stations. The program covers the period up to the year 2000; and it envisages that by the beginning of the new century, the total capacity of atomic electric power stations in the CEMA countries, not counting the USSR, will be increased to 50 million kilowatts -- as against the present 8 million. That means that 30 to 40 percent of the total electricity produced will be generated at atomic stations. And I think this decision, and its unanimity, and incidentally the positive response it's getting in the socialist countries, is very important -- let us not pretend otherwise -- in the light of, taking into account, the accident at Chernobyl. And, by the way, our magazine writes in its latest issue that the fourth set of the atomic electric power station in Southern Moravia, in Czechoslovakia, has just been started. And the correspondent we asked to prepare a reportage about the opening of the station was pretty meticulous in the questions he put to both the chief engineer and other experts as regards safety measures. It's very characteristic that they'd envisaged and rehearsed even the most improbable situations -- even the event, for instance, that, God forbid, an aircraft might crash on to the station, or, again, the possibility of various systems being put out of action. And generally, the Czechoslovakian experts spoke with great confidence of the safety cordon. Altogether, it's clear that this is the only promising sphere in solving the power problem at the present stage, and as you see, the CEMA countries are implementing it vigorously and harmoniously.

[Zholkver] I'd like to add that cooperation is being expanded in the implementation of another very important program, too -- our country's food program. Here, cooperation is underway in various areas of activity. Let me give a few examples of what I'd call the most direct involvement in this program. For instance, a joint Polish-Soviet enterprise is being built in one small Polish town. It's a food factory that will manufacture a varied range of semifinished products from potatoes. Poland has modern technology for potato production, and this large enterprise will supply potato semi-products to both Poland and the Soviet Union. As another example, you mentioned, Rudolf Georgiyevich, our cooperation with Czechoslovakia. There's a little town in Slovakia, Nove Zamky -- you've probably been there -- where they have a small engineering works, "Sigma", specializing in pumps for irrigation systems, including irrigation systems in the Soviet Union. That's also a contribution to the food program.

[Lebedev] While on the subject of the restructuring of economic and scientific-technical links between Soviet enterprises and enterprises in the other socialist countries, I think one should underline particularly the very businesslike and, I'd say, real nature of that restructuring. We talk about joint enterprises. So far, there aren't many. One of the oldest, I think, is probably the mining and enrichment combine at Erdenet in Mongolia, which has been in operation for quite a while. But there are not many of them yet, and so the question is, when will we have them? What will they be like? And this brings me to what I want to say about Soviet-Polish joint enterprises, for example. Preparations for commissioning them are already in hand, on a very businesslike basis. The managers of several Polish and Soviet factories have been getting together. The necessary technical documentation is being drawn up, and the engineers are interpreting the mechanisms of a new joint production process. How soon these joint enterprises will start operating, will now depend directly on the specific labor collectives, on the state bodies whose job it is to stimulate their work. But here it's necessary to stress that whereas formerly the countries collaborated more at the highest level, at the level of ministries, now cooperation is being organized between labor collectives and enterprises. This a guarantee of economic successes, and it's also a guarantee of the political strength of our community.

[Zholkver] Moreover, not only bilateral -- this is the basis at present it is true -- but also multilateral cooperation. There are very much such examples where you see how the one thing is successfully combined with another. You have mentioned the example of Poland. Indeed, for instance in Gdansk recently an unusual anniversary was marked at the "Lenin" shipyard, the 900th vessel left the slips of this Gdansk shipyard, and this vessel, a large dry-cargo vessel, was built to an order from the Soviet Union once again. But it is interesting that after this at another shipyard, not so well known, but there in Gdansk there is the relatively small Wisla yard. Until recently this yard built small vessels for fishing. At present a quite new research catamaran vessel from the Iskatel series, as it is called, for work on the "Shelf" program, that is to say for oil recovery from the depths of the sea-bed, has been created on a joint Soviet-Polish project. And here's the interesting part. It would appear to be a Soviet-Polish project, but elaboration of the "Shelf" program is not only going on in our countries but also in Vietnam, for example. This means that here bilateral cooperation turns into multilateral cooperation, and what is particularly important, countries with a higher level of economic development are rendering assistance to countries that are only coming up.

[Kolchanov] Yes, this was noted at the 42d sitting of the CEMA session. This was particularly stressed in relation to Cuba, as well as Vietnam and Mongolia.

[Zholkver] This was clearly demonstrated just now at the Congress of the Lao People's Revolutionary Party. In the report by Comrade Phomvihan it was noted, in particular, that over the past decade the social product in this country, which was under foreign domination for 200 years and at times was not even represented on the map of the world, in this country the gross national product has doubled over a decade. The income per head of the population has increased by 60 percent. I would note especially that work to eliminate illiteracy in Laos has largely been completed. And Comrade Phomvihan noted openly that this is the contribution not only of the Laotian people itself, but also of the fraternal assistance from all socialist countries. I think that in this connection generally one should note that socialist states are not only coordinating their economic, but also their foreign policies successfully. Thus at the Moscow meeting all the leaders of the fraternal parties unanimously support the principled position of the Soviet Union in Reykjavik. At the moment this is more than topical -- 1 month exactly has passed since the Soviet-U.S. meeting in the Icelandic capital. It seems to me personally that when you talk about the month that has passed since Reykjavik one cannot but note that the world over that time has in many respects already become a different place.

I remember that FRG Foreign Minister Genscher has stated in the past few days that it would be impossible to return to pre-Reykjavik times, although such attempts are being made here and there, as is well known, primarily in Washington. But as for our country, at both the Moscow meeting and in speeches by Comrade Gorbachev directly after Reykjavik our striving to go further was stressed. Well, an agreement did not come from Reykjavik. This development has to be continued and it is exactly this aim that the Soviet proposals were pursuing that were submitted after Reykjavik, on 7 November if I am not mistaken, by the Soviet delegation in Geneva.

[Lebedev] Yes, that is quite right, Aleksandr Vladimirovich. Altogether you have, in my opinion, given a fair account of this tendency, or rather the struggle between two tendencies. The one -- this is not making it appear that nothing at all happened, but at least trying to give a quite different tenor to those accords, or the rapprochement in positions that took place there, and, well, the other tendency is to really move forward, which we are calling for, based, of course, on the closeness in positions which they succeeded in achieving there. And in this connection over the past days I would not, for example, be so bold as to predict which of the two tendencies is winning through. For we know that virtually the same groups of experts, made up of almost the same people that sat over the nights in Reykjavik sat in Vienna.

[Zholkver] You mean the Soviet-U.S. talks?

[Lebedev] The Soviet-U.S. talks that went on in Vienna, taking advantage of the stay there of both the Soviet foreign minister and Secretary of State Shultz. And once again, unfortunately, the result looks fairly discouraging because the U.S. side is once again trying to prove, and moreover prove by very unfitting means, that an agreement was made on something quite different.

[Zholkver] What do you mean?

[Lebedev] Well, for instance, they are making it appear that when the U.S. President talked about America's readiness to achieve a scrapping of nuclear weapons, or at least a cardinal reduction, by 50 percent, of strategic armaments, then it turns out that President Reagan, despite what was recorded at Reykjavik, had in mind not a reduction generally in all strategic offensive armaments, but merely in ballistic missiles.

I'm sorry, but this is an attempt, well, as I said, using unfitting means, because everyone knows that the United States would acquire an overwhelming superiority in heavy bombers with long-range cruise missiles for instance, and so on. In Geneva the Soviet-U.S. talks on nuclear and space armaments have continued. It is only just now, if I'm not mistaken, that their sixth round has ended. And today I was a little -- well I won't stay in confusion -- but astounded when I read a statement by the head of the U.S. delegation, Kampelman, after the end of this round. Mr. Kampelman is making it appear that everything is, you know, as in the song: Madame la Marquise, tout va tres bien, tres bien. At the same time when you read the statement of the head of the Soviet delegation, Comrade Karpov, then a rather different picture reveals itself, namely that unfortunately the U.S. delegation remains in its position and a constructive response, which presupposes that the United States will embark upon a radical reduction in nuclear armaments, of the whole of the triad, that is to say that both sides are accepting the reduction of all their strategic offensive nuclear weapons without exception -- there is no such understanding. What are they expecting from us, strictly speaking? Maybe that, as appears fleetingly sometimes in the press even in the statements of some Western officials, certain domestic difficulties, as they allege will force the Soviet Union to make some concessions.

In this regard I believe that the reaction to this of Paul Nitze, was very correct. He is a veteran of all these talks, who was in Reykjavik too, by the way, an aide to the U.S. President. He said that, first of all, the Russians would not make any concessions that would subject their security to a threat and, second, that he did not believe in any possibility of concessions of the basis of certain domestic difficulties.

[Kolchanov] I should like to add to what was said by Aleksandr Aleksandrovich what was expressed a few days ago by Comrade Ligachev at a press conference in Helsinki. This also concerned specific, quite specific proposals that are directed at curbing the arms race, and which in the final analysis lead to disarmament, although they concern North Europe as such. Comrade Ligachev named four points very specifically and precisely. The first point: what has the Soviet Union already done to move along this road, to demonstrate its real striving for peace? We have already dismantled launching installations for medium-range missiles on the Kola Peninsula, most of the launch installations for such missiles on the remaining territory of the Leningrad and Baltic region military districts. We have transferred from these districts seven divisions of operational tactical missiles. These are concrete steps.

Second, in confirming our support for the idea of giving non-nuclear status to the waters of the Baltic Sea within the framework of the implementation of the proposals for a nuclear-free North, we could, Comrade Ligachev said, in the event of the achieving of an accord on this matter between the appropriate states, withdraw from the complement of the Soviet Baltic Fleet submarines equipped with ballistic missiles -- a major step, a constructive step.

Third, in supporting the idea of possible confidence-building measures applying to North Europe and the waters of the seas adjacent to this region the Soviet Union is proposing that a limitation on the intensity of large military maneuvers in this region be started, and fourth, which was talked about at the press conference in Helsinki, we share the thought that in the way of strengthening confidence-building measures in the naval sphere the positive experience should be used of the Soviet-U.S. agreement of 1972 on averting incidents in the open sea and in the air space above it.

Besides the essential content, so to speak, of this fourth point I should like to stress one point. Across the ocean fairly often they kick up a racket about alleged nonobservance by the Soviet Union of accords that were signed previously and this case shows the extent that the Soviet Union apporoaches all agreements that have been signed previously honestly, and the extent that it follows the letter and spirit of these agreements.

[Zholkver] Well, it's perfectly obvious why they have, let's say, taken up arms so much in that same Washington against the antimissile defense treaty, because it hinders the deployment of space weapons. Now, in fact, everyone accepts that the main -- and, perhaps, the only -- reason why no agreement could be reached at Reykjavik is SDI, the U.S. so-called Strategic Defense Initiative, which the Americans themselves far more accurately call the Star Wars program.

Here are some curious comments from the United States last week. The first comment is by the eminent U.S. scientist Jerome Wiesner. He is the honorary president of the Massachusetts Institute of Technology and former scientific adviser to Presidents Kennedy and Johnson. He has now declared plainly that Reykjavik showed that the two aims -- the so-called space defense and the freeing of the whole world from the nuclear threat -- contradict one another. All the "i"s have been dotted. It is a case of "either, or."

Incidentally, this same Jerome Wiesner acknowledges that, from the purely technical -- and, if you will, technological -- point of view, the SDI program is impracticable. It is dangerous, but it is impracticable. And, incidentally, even such a specialist in fantastic projects that do not always seem to be technically feasible as Arthur Clarke, one of the greatest U.S. writers of sciece fiction, also states that, in fact, these U.S. projects in space -- he calls them Stars of Death, the title, perhaps, of Arthur Clarke's next novel -- he said they are not practicable from the point of view of the creation of a defensive umbrella, but they may, unfortunately, become a highly effective offensive weapon for the purpose of, as he puts it, overseeing the whole world.

[Labedev] And, in general, it may generate very dangerous, new kinds of weapons, little known at the moment and even scarcely conceivable by the human imagination. And that, of course, destabilizes the situation. That, in my view, constitutes the main danger of the SDI program. It undermines the main foundation for any possible future accord on strategic offensive weapons and on the whole complex of nuclear weapons -- specifically, the principle of equality and equal security.

[Kolchanov] SDI is, in general, like a many-headed dragon. There are very many really harmful aspects to the program, and we were just talking about the political, military-technical ones, and so forth, but here is another, highly important kind of harm -- the harm that is, as it were, socioeconomic. All these programs, incidentally, inflict damage primarily not on those against whom SDI is being prepared, but on those whom SDI is being prepared to defend -- the Americans temselves. We had visitors at our newspaper from the U.S. PEOPLE'S DAILY WORLD, and our colleagues concentrated mainly on the socioeconomic aspects of the program. I shall quote just a few excertps from the remarks made by our U.S. colleagues. Here's what is written, for example: Every $1 billion of capital investment taken out of civilian production in order to develop Star Wars or other weapons systems means the loss of at least 14,000 jobs. The 2-3.5 trillion handed over to the Pentagon and the military-industrial complex will mean the loss over the next 15-20 years of 28-49 million jobs. Iron and steel, engineering and, in general, all kinds of manufacturing industry will suffer most. That's what is written by our colleagues from the U.S. PEOPLE'S DAILY WORLD.

[Zholkver] But, you know, it seems to me that, when we talk in this way about just the problems of nuclear and space weapons, the thought may well occur to one: but are the so-called conventional weapons any less dangerous nowadays? After all, it doesn't make much difference to anyone whatever kind of weapons they've died from. And so I must say that the Soviet Union is campaigning just as actively for a reduction in conventional weapons. I was recently in Vienna, where a meeting is being held between the representatives of states taking part in the all-European Conference. Our delegation also submitted proposals about the military aspects of security on the continent of Europe and recalled that, in Budapest, the Warsaw Pact states had tabled absolutely concrete proposals on the subject: in the course of 1-2 years, the numbers of troops in the NATO and Warsaw Pact countries would be cut by 100-150,000 on each side, and then, in the early nineties, it is intended to carry out a further reduction in land-based troops and tactical air forces by 25 percent. That is a reduction of half a million men on each side. In other words, there would be 1 million fewer soldiers in Europe.

[Kolchanov] What's more, we are ready to discuss it, Aleksandr Vladimirovich, at various forums -- both at the Vienna meeting, at the Vienna talks on reducing armed forces and weapons in Central Europe; and within the framwork of the mandate, as it were, for Stockholm-2, as it's already being called now, which the Vienna meeting now in progress has to draw up; and within the framework of consultations between Warsaw Pact and NATO representatives; and at all forums with the participation both of neutral and of nonaligned countries. It is important to set things in motion.

[Zholkver] I must say that such a position is supported, in general, by states that are by no means just in the European region. I have seen the statement made in Parliament by Rajiv Gandhi, the prime minister of India. It is now taking on particular significance, since, as you know, an announcement has been made about the forthcoming visit to India by Mikhail Sergeyevich Gorbachev. And, when speaking in Parliament, the Indian prime minister declared that the positive point about the Reykjavik meeting is that both sides came very close to reaching an agreement, even though no solution was actually achieved. And now, Rajiv Gandhi stated, the leadership of the two great powers is required to display wise statesmanship and he plainly declared that the main thing is to guarantee that the Star Wars program does not stand in the way of disarmament.

I remember that speech by the Indian prime minister when I was preparing television material about the sessions of the First Committee of the UN General Assembly. It's now time for decisions there too. Resolutions considered at the session of the General Assembly are being adopted. The vast majority of the resolutions are aimed primarily at curbing the race for nuclear weapons, since they are the most dangerous. I saw some curious statistics here. Twenty-eight resolutions have already been adopted, mainly about these issues: halting nuclear tests, nondeployment of nuclear weapons, reductions in them and the prospects for their total elimination. So, 28 resolutions have been adopted. Only in three cases did the United States find it possible to vote in favor -- on secondary issues, by the way. In four cases, it abstained. Twenty-one times, it voted against, voting seven times in complete isolation, against drafts that had been prepared jointly by both socialist and nonaligned states, including with the participation of a number of capitalist countries. It seems to me that these statistics reflect very vividly the balance of forces in the modern world: the consistent peace-loving policy of the socialist community, and this United States policy of neoglobalism, which manifests itself both in relation to the arms race and in a whole series of regional conflicts.

We will end our roundtable conversation at that point. Thank you, colleagues, for taking part in it. Thank you, comrade listeners, for your attention.

CSCE DELEGATE CRITICIZES U.S. HUMAN RIGHTS RECORD

LD161120 Moscow TASS in English 1107 GMT 16 Nov 86

[Text] Vienna November 16 TASS -- The follow-up meeting on security and cooperation in Europe is continuing in Vienna.

Addressing its session, member of the Soviet delegation V. Morozov said that the Soviet delegation intended to concretize the proposal made by Eduard Shevardnadze, member of the Politburo of the CPSU Central Committee and foreign minister of the USSR, for holding in Moscow a representative conference of the participating countries on problems of humanitarian cooperation, and submit it for consideration to the Vienna meeting.

He observed that there existed a close interrelationship between peace and humanitarian cooperation, between security and human rights.

Regrettably, the recognition of the right to peace as a basic human right was not reflected in practical deeds of the United States which, through its aggressive policy toward Nicaragua and the Mediterranean, through nuclear explosions in Nevada and the "Star Wars" programme, demonstrated disregard for the human right to peace and, as a consequence, for the right to life.

Morozov said that the Soviet delegation, and Soviet public opinion, were seriously alarmed by the U.S. attempts to evade a serious discussion on human rights, to reduce that important problem to the issue of the emigration of citizens from other CSCE countries.

Soviet public opinion resolutely protested against the violation by the U.S. and some other Western countries of key provisions of the Helsinki Final Act calling for broader familiarization with and understanding of various aspects of the life of other participating nations as a means of strengthening trust among peoples.

The final document of the Madrid follow-up meeting called on all participants, who had not made it so far, to consider the possibility of joining international covenants on human rights, said the Soviet representative.

The U.S., however, failed as yet to respond to this call that had been signed by its representative as well.

"Why did it again place itself in opposition to all other countries participants in the CSCE process?

How can the delegation of a country where 30 million people live below the official poverty line, where there are 15 million jobless and two million homeless and in which various special services maintain 15 files on each American, act as a mentor on questions of human rights?"

AFP Version

AU142116 Paris AFP in English 2103 GMT 14 Nov 86

[Text] Vienna, Nov 14 (AFP) -- The United States and the Soviet Union accused one another of serious human right violations in sharp exchanges at the Conference on Security and Cooperation in Europe (CSCE) here Friday.

Head of the U.S. delegation Warren Zimmermann cited the cases of 36 people "who are victims of this lack of compliance' with the human rights accords in the Helsinki Final Act, signed by 35 countries. In response, Soviet delegation member Vladimir Morozov outlined what he called a "list of gross violations" of human rights in the United States. "How can the delegation of a country where 30 million people live below the official poverty line, where 15 million are jobless and two million homeless, where every American is entered on 15 different files, how can it play the role of mentor in human rights?" he asked.

Mr Zimmermann, who according to wintesses at the closed door session described life inside Soviet camps, raised the issue of those who fought for the right to practise their religion or for the rights of national minorities. He added that the United States recognised that "the picture is not uniformly black," citing the cases of recently released Soviet citizens Yuriy Orlov and Anatoliy Shcharansky. Mr Morozov said he was unhappy at "attempts by the United States to avoid serious discussion on human rights and to reduce this important problem simply to the departure of citizens from other countries."

Head of the Liechtenstein delegation mario von Ledebert-Wicheln called for a minute of silence for "victims of repression," which was refused by the Soviet Union as "inappropriate," reliable sources said.

Kola Missiles Withdrawal Cited

AU141702 Paris AFP in English 1656 GMT 14 Nov 86

[Text] Vienna Nov 14 (AFP) -- The Soviet delegation at the European security conference here Friday rejected allegations that Moscow announced the withdrawal of its medium-range nuclear missiles from the Kola Peninsula in order to divert attention from human rights issues.

Soviet delegate General Viktor Tatarnikov at the Conference on Security and Cooperation in Europe (CSCE) described the claim as "naive and without foundation" in a news conference here. He said the three parts of the CSCE conference -- security, economy and human rights -- "are for us of equal importance."

Soviet number two leader Yegor Ligachev announced in Helsinki Thursday that all medium-range missle launchers in the Kola Peninsula, adjoining Finland, had been dismantled, along with most of launchers in the Leningrad and Baltic military districts.

Yuriy Kashlev, the chief Soviet CSCE delegate, said "the word security" had been missing from CSCE talks and that judging by their statements, several delegations wanted to forget that the Helsinki Final Act was about "security and cooperation."

The 35 signatories of the 1975 accord -- all of Europe except for Albania, plus the United States and Canada -- have just finished the second week of their review of the Helsinki accord.

During full sessions of the conference, which have been held behind closed doors, the U.S., Canadian, Dutch and British delegations have all criticised human rights breaches, said Rudolf Torovsky the Austrian delegation chief.

In a news conference Mr Torovsky said that the Soviet response to these criticisms had been "measured" and that it had seldom used the argument that it was foreign interference in Soviet internal affairs.

At the opening of the CSCE review conference Soviet Foreign Minister Eduard Shevardnadze suggested the holding of a human rights conference in Moscow and this was welcomed Thursday by U.S. delegation chief Warren Zimmerman as a "very interesting idea."

Mr Zimmerman said he had detected a certain degree of "unprecedented" openness in contacts with the Soviet delegation.

KRASNAYA ZVEZDA CITES TATARNIKOV VIENNA SPEECH

PM141405 Moscow KRASNAYA ZVEZDA in Russian 14 Nov 86 Second Edition p 3

[Text] Vienna, 13 Nov -- Major V.M. Tatarnikov, member of the Soviet delegation, spoke in the discussion that is continuing at the Vienna meeting of representatives of the CSCE states. His speech was devoted to military aspects of security on the European continent.

In the USSR's opinion, he noted, the Vienna meeting is designed to provide the Stockholm conference with a mandate that would enable it to work out accords on reductions in armed forces and conventional arms in Europe. The balanced program for European disarmament proposed by the Warsaw Pact states in Budapest is a good basis for this. It encompasses a wide geographical area -- from the Atlantic to the Urals. In the USSR's opinion, it should be phased in.

As a first step a one-time reciprocal reduction in NATO and Warsaw Pact troops of 150-200,000 men could take place over 1-2 years. Subsequently, in the early nineties, there would be further 25 percent reductions in comparison with present levels in ground forces and tactical aircraft. These reductions would amount to over 500,000 people on each side.

Needless to say, thes responsible steps need to be reliably monitored. The socialist countries propose using both national and international means for this purpose, including on-site inspection.

The public in the European countries are concerned at the intensification in tension as a result of the policy being pursued by the NATO countries. The United States and certain NATO countries use various types of propaganda schemes in order to justify the militarization of the European continent. They talk about the "Soviet military threat" while themselves discussing questions of using medium-range missiles to inflict a first strike, as was the case at the 21-22 October NATO Nuclear Planning Group session. They talk about "openness" [otkrytost], but apply the concept solely to ground forces; when it is a question of the navy or air force -- that is, multirole strike weapons and dangerous types of arms -- this openness evaporates. Or take the question of confidence-building measures. It is well known that, despite the measures worked out at Stockholm, the territories of a number of states participating in the European process are still beyond the scope of these measures. It is natural that other participating states which have undertaken far-reaching commitments would not want to remain ignorant of what is happening on those territories. This entire range of questions must be examined in detail at the following stage of the Stockholm conference.

In the Soviet Union's opinion, the questions of strengthening security and ensuring disarmament concern all Europeans and require corresponding status. That is why the USSR calls on the participants in the Vienna meeting to work persistently in all avenues of the Final Act without exception.

CONTINUING COMMENTS ON U.S. ARMS TO IRAN

Growing Scandal

LD162121 Moscow Television Service in Russian 1500 GMT 16 Nov 86

[From the "International Panorama" program presented by Boris Kalyagin]

[Text] [Kalyagin] The policy of the present Washington administration is not infrequently dubbed as unpredictable. The United States continues to surprise unpleasantly even its own allies. This is also confirmed by another political scandal involving the delivery of U.S. weapons to Iran. Let us recall that since the people's revolution in Iran, which overthrew the Shah's regime, the U.S. policy towards that country has been of an adventurist nature. The inglorious failure of the U.S. assault landing in Iran remains in the memory, and now another assault has become common knowledge, although it is true it is of a somewhat different nature.

The former assistant to the U.S. President for National Security Affairs, McFarlane, secretly visited Tehran. He did not fly in empty-handed. He smuggled in spare parts for U.S. airplanes which are the basis of the Iranian air force. Apart from military equipment, McFarlane took with him a cake as a present, in the form of a key. This was a symbol of sorts. With the aid of the dispatched presents it was proposed to open the door leading to the restoration of U.S. positions in Iran. However, it would have been more logical to make a cake shaped not as a key, but as a skeleton-key. After all, the whole operation was of an illegal and dishonest nature: the United States professed its total neutrality in the Iran-Iraq conflict, offficial Washington announced that it had imposed a ban on the export of any military equipment to Iran and demanded the same from its allies. Now it becomes clear that the United States has for 18 months been secretly delivering arms to Iran. These deliveries were carried out with the help of Israel. They were accomplished both by air and by sea; this was confirmed in particular by the Danish sailors who were on the vessel which set off from the Israeli port of Elat to Iran. On board it had 26 containers with U.S. munitions. All these disclosures have had the effect of a bombshell within the United States itself.

[Dunayev] In America they usually find a justification for any scandal, but at the moment they can't, try as they might. At first the President and his team counted on sitting out the storm and waiting for it to stop, but in 10 days it has gathered such strength that they have started writing about the wind of Watergate here, the wind of the largest scandal in the whole of U.S. history which cost Nixon the post of president. Explanations were needed, and namely from the President himself, and on Thursday evening Ronald Reagan hastily organized a television address -- they literally announced it an hour before, this was done in a hurry. It must be said that many people here hoped that the news emanating from the Near East would not be confirmed, that the President would be able to dispel it. Anybody but Reagan, the observers said, could have supplied Iran with weapons in exchange for U.S. hostages. Precisely now several U.S. and Israeli businessmen have appeared in court accused of illegally and secretly sending weapons to Iran -- did the President really do the same, in like illegal and secret fashion?

The thrust of the President's 15-minute television address consisted of the following:

It turns out that his administration supplied Iran with weapons not for the sake of exchanging them for hostages, or to split the leadership in Iran, or for the war with Iraq which Iran is waging with U.S. weapons, since it got them from the time of the Shah and for which it desperately needs spare parts, but everything was done, as the President maintained, because of Iran's geography, because of the fact that its neighbor is the Soviet Union. This country, our country, the Soviet Union, in the President's version, threatens Iran, and so what was there left for the poor United States to do except to quickly set up an arms bridge. Suddenly the Americans may believe it. After all, it is not the first time here in Washington that they have tried to transfer their sins onto the Russians.

But meticulous observers immediately noted at this point: Why do all this secretly? As is known, Washington supplies weapons, and supplies weapons openly to countries which border with the Soviet Union, and what is more, it even supplies them to subversives antigovernmental forces, as in Afghanistan, for example, and is not ashamed of it. Here we suddenly have such shyness. In his address the President emphasized that he supplied Iran only with defensive weapons, and here one immediately recalls his Strategic Defensive Initiative -- you know, he has taken up all-round defense!

Judging by the response from the press and congress -- where, by the way, hearings will begin next Friday, 25 November in a commission on the legality of the operation which the President carried out -- so, judging by the first response, the President's address did not make an impression on politicians and Congressmen here in the U.S. capital. Speaker of the House of Representatives, O'Neill, said that it must be investigated in Congress -- the President's address did not explain anything. Congressmen Les Aspin, the Chairman of the Armed Services Committee, said that he thinks a very big error has been made. The ABC television company White House correspondent, Sam Donaldson, said the following: The President went through a minefield during his address. If Carter were the president now, the process of impeachment, that is removal from power, would have already been started against him.

[Kalyagin] The scandal around the secret U.S. arms supplies is growing. Many are asking a reasonable question: How can one trust an administration which says one thing and does the very opposite? The point here is of a major foreign policy failure by Washington which one doubts that they'll be able to suppress.

Dunayev: 'New Watergate' Shown

LD141502 Moscow Domestic Service in Russian 0700 GMT 14 Nov 86

[Vladimir Dunayev report from New York]

[Excerpts] People are talking about a new Watergate in Washington today. This is not only in the corridors, as I heard it earlier in the week, but on the pages of the capital's most respectable newspaper, THE WASHINGTON POST. [passage omitted] The admissions of U.S. President Reagan at a meeting with Congress leaders -- the meeting was behind closed doors, but its contents were leaked to the press -- to the effect that, (?bypassing) Congress, the State Department and even the CIA arms have more than once been supplied to Iran, have astounded many here. The present action is close to the biggest scandal of the postwar United States, Watergate, not only by the scale of the scandal, and of the White House attempts to cover it up at any cost, but also by the methods used. [passage omitted]

Much resembles or repeats Watergate, but something is even worse: Now it is not the case of two political parties in the United States (?spying on each other), but there are now cowboy raids in the international arena, and furthermore in deep secret. The time has come to ask President Reagan whether he can have control over the military, as THE WASHINGTON POST writes. It continues: An inevitable reply to this is: No, he cannot. Politicians and journalists are angry with the administration, not because the foreign policy is dangerous, unpredictable, imperial, but because there was no need to get caught! This is why they are angry. By the time the new Congress convenes -- this will be in January -- the threat to carry out investigations which can now be heard will be forgotten, the more so because the thread also leads to the undeclared war against Nicaragua, the [word indistinct] of Libya, the attack on Grenada -- all this has been prepared by the same military from the National Security Council.

While the latest affair, arms supplies to Iran, is being examined and even condemned by the press, other operations are taboo, prohibited topics.

PRAVDA Criticism

PM142151 Moscow PRAVDA in Russians 15 Nov 86 First Edition p 5

[V. Gan Washington dispatch: "The Secret Comes Out"]

[Text] Washington, 14 Nov -- President Reagan admitted when speaking on national television that the United States had been making arms deliveries to Iran but "in modest quantities."

Clumsily skirting round the "sharp corners," Reagan relied mainly on unconcealed demagoguery. If he is to be believed then, in weaving a plot against Iran, the United States, it transpires, was guided by the most "noble" intentions, namely, of promoting... a cessation of the war between Iran and Iraq.

With reference to U.S. officials, sources in Congress, and "informed Israelis," THE WASHINGTON POST writes that the White House wanted to renew contacts with pro-American elements in Iran and also to "establish new channels to Tehran with the aid of the Iranian emigre community and America's allies." Tel Aviv was plugged into the business, having a broad network of agents in Iran. Circumventing existing U.S. laws, the White House undertook deliveries of weapons to Iran thereby counting on buying influence among its military.

In his speech, Reagan took responsibility, declaring that he personally had sanctioned the military deliveries to Iran. "My aim was to convince Tehran that our representatives were acting with my sanction." In the words of the President, these deliveries were allegedly limited merely to "batches of defensive weapons and spare parts." However, THE WASHINGTON POST points out, "other officials said that they probably included ground-to-air missiles, antitank weapons, and spare parts for the American F-14 fighters with which Iran is armed."

It is worth stating that all these machinations were performed behind the back not only of the U.S. Congress, but also of the competent federal departments.

In a nutshell, with the President's "blessing" a narrow group of administration staffers did everything it deemed necessary to lay, as it was expressed by a "senior official of the administration" who had begged journalists not to name him, "the foundation for relations with Iran in the event of the replacement of Khomeyni's government with a more moderate regime." Laws, morals, and the norms of international law were not taken into account.

In his speech, Reagan sought to cover all this international gangsterism with peacemaking arguments, counting, it is to be supposed, on a naive and uninformed audience. To justify the United States' hegemonistic schemes regarding Iran and the whole region of the Near East and Southwest Asia, the President put forward an altogether fantastic "argument" declaring that the United States was saving "Iran" from... "Soviet domination." However, he himself immediately let slip the true motives for the subersive operation. "The oil reserves of Iran," he observed, "play an important role for the long-term health of the economy" of the West. Reagan thereby confirmed a well known fact, the U.S. Near East policy is permeated with oil. However, it also contains a "Soviet factor." Alluding to its sources in the White House, THE WASHINGTON POST notes: "It is declared that Reagan also hopes that the United States will ultimately be able to restore its electronic eavesdropping stations in Iran for the surveillance of Soviet missile installations."

IZVESTIYA Comments

PM142051 Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian 15 Nov 86 Morning Edition p 5

[Own correspondent A. Blinov dispatch "The White House Secret Kitchen"]

[Text] Washington -- The U.S. Adminstration is trying in every way to suppress the scandal which has been caused by the unexpected publicity which its attempts to establish secret contacts "with the moderate wing" of the Iranian leadership and to organize secret deliveries of weapons and military hardware to Iran have received.

On Thursday President Reagan, who had until then refrained from public statements, tried to justify these actions. In his speech which was broadcast on U.S. television, he expressed displeasure with the fact that for 10 days the international and U.S. press had published "rumors" about the White House steps regarding Iran -- rumors which were unfavorable to the administration. Forced to explain the administration's actions, Reagan said that for the past 18 months the White House had been implementing a "secret diplomatic initiative." In his words this initiative was aimed at the "restoration of relations with Iran" and even at ..."ending, in a dignified manner, the 6-year bloody war betwen Iran and Iraq."

The President did not go into detail as to how he had hoped to achieve an end to the Iran-Iraq war. In his speech he also failed to mention such important aspects of the White House's secret diplomacy as using Israel in the role of mediator and the question of linkage between arms deliveries and the hostage problem.

The explanations furnished by the U.S. President drew skeptical remarks from a number of politicians and press organs. Thus Senator R. Byrd, the Democratic leader in the Senate, declared that the President's speech failed to satisfy him. Many questions have remained unanswered, he said in an interviw with the ABC network.

Meanwhile the U.S. newspapers continue to publish information exposing the mechanism of the White House's secret diplomacy. [paragraph continues]

It emerges from this that the National Security Council was assigned a central role in playing the White House's secret gambit regarding Iran. This body, which is directly subordinated to the President is not answerable to Congressional committees, while its leader -- The President's assistant for national security affairs -- is not confirmed by the Senate as is the case, for instance, with cabinet secretaries. In accordance with its status, the National Security Council is merely required to give recommendations to the President and to coordinate the activities of departments in the appropriate sphere. However, under President Reagan, the National Security Council has begun not only to coordinate, but also to independently carry out the most sensitive [ostryy] secret operations and has in essense become a state within a state. Thus, over the past year the National Security Council has taken charge of operations for supplying Nicaraguan "contras" with weapons in circumvention of U.S. legislation. Questions from a number of congressional bodies concerning the actions of the National Security Council were rejected by the White House which alluded to "the privilege of executive power."

It was precisely the National Security Council that initiated the U.S. secret operations regarding Iran.

The direct leadership of the operation was exercised initially by R. McFarlane who occupied the post of Presidential Assistant for national security affairs. After he left this post his successor, J. Poindexter began to exercise overall leadership, while Marine Lieutenant Colonel O. North, deputy director of the National Security Council's military political bureau, dealt with specific issues.

As THE NEW YORK TIMES writes, in the opinion of congressmen, foreign policy experts, and officials of the administration, the interference by staffers of the National Security Council in operations of a semimilitary nature represents "a fundamental change in its traditional role."

In the assessment of the well known journalists R. Evans and R. Novak, the National Security Council under the leadership of McFarlane and Poindexter has been transformed into "a powerful instrument for conducting policy" and has played the part of a kind of "shadow CIA" in the White House's Iranian affair. "They have gone far further than the national Security Council has previously done" said NEW YORK TIMES correspondent David Aaron, who occupied the post of deputy assistant to the President for National security affairs under President Carter.

Continued Contacts Criticized

NC151304 Moscow in Persian to Iran 1100 GMT 15 Nov 86

[Igor Sheftunov commentary]

[Text] The world public has focused its attention on a scandal resulting from revelations last week about clandestine visits by U.S. Administration representatives to Iran. Following the lead of Lebanon's AL-SHIRA' weekly, the world press has published comments on the secret visit by Robert McFarlane, President Reagan's former security adviser, and by other representatives of the Washington administration to Iran. Hojjat ol-Eslam Hashemi-Rafsanjani, speaker of the Islamic Consultative Assembly, had to admit that McFarlane's visit to Tehran had taken place. President Reagan and his present national security adviser, Poindexter, also admitted that representatives of the U.S. Administration have been paying secret visits to Iran for the past 18 months.

Washington wants to assure that these visits were aimed at discussing the export of U.S. arms to Iran and facilitating the release of American hostages. At the same time, it resorts to all possible means to hide the true objective of the visits. This major and basic objective is the implementation of the confidential program of intensifying the activities of pro-American forces in Iran. The Washington administration drew up this program in a plot engineered with Israel, and it is trying to expand and strengthen its network of agents in Iran, which after the Shah's downfall have been acting clandestinely. U.S. allies with close contacts with Iran, primarily Pakistan, are used to achieve this end. Last Monday, Lebanon's AL-SAFIR reported that supporters of Mohammad Reza Pahlavi's crown prince have been established in Pakistan under the auspices of U.S. militarists and General Ziaul Haq's regime. Among these the group of General Oveysi, the Shah's general who was justly dubbed by Iranians as the Tehran Executioner, is very active. Members of these groups receive special training under the leadership of American, Israeli, and Pakistani instructors and are then sent to Iran. As all incidents indicate, the conclusion reached in Washington is that the time is right to try to bring their puppets to power in Iran. They are very hopeful that the Iran-Iraq war of attrition, which is in its 7th year, has weakened both sides and their economies and has created an oil crisis, which is both countries' major source of revenue. Washington is trying to exploit the situation as much as possible to impose its support for Iran. A CBS correspondent who interviewed Reagan said after the interview that those groups in Iran that make Iran's rapprochement with the United States possible, or, more simply, make Iran subject to Washington's will, can depend on the U.S. Administration's financial and military assistance.

It is not the first time that McFarlane, who recently paid a secret visit to Tehran, has been assigned a special secret mission to Iran. A former colonel in the U.S. Marine Corps, McFarlane was directly involved 6 years ago in the landing in Tabas of U.S. commandos by helicopters based on U.S. aircraft carriers. This landing was to be signal for the monarchists and other pro-U.S. groups to commence operations aimed at gaining power. As you know, this operation failed from the outset, and the commandos had to flee Iran quickly.

Recently the White House decided to send McFarlane on a confidential mission to Iran. But his trip was, to Washington's surprise, widely reported. As a result, an international scandal and commotion arose. Nevertheless, Washington is not thinking of giving up. White House spokesmen have said that President Reagan has decided to continue secret contacts with Iran, and Poindexter has stressed the importance of these contacts, saying that they should be kept secret so that Washington can expand and preserve its contacts with American sympathizers in Iran.

The policy of plotting and harsh intervention in Iran's domestic affairs pursued by Washington continues.

Kudrin Quotes Participants

LD141955 Moscow Television Service in Russian 1545 GMT 14 Oct 86

[From "The World Today" program presented by Igor Kudrin]

[Text] At last, following 10 days of contradictory polemics and all kinds of rumor and embarrassment, President Reagan admitted that the United States has carried out arms deliveries to Iran -- but in modest amounts, he said.

At the same time the President denied reports of any deal with the kidnappers of the U.S. hostages in Lebanon. Addressing the surprised U.S. people on television, the President set forth a highly original argument to justify deliveries of arms to a country that is at war with Iraq. The administration has more than once proclaimed its strict neutrality in that 6-year war, and now it has come up with a new argument: In sending arms to Iran, the United States is striving to promote an end to the conflict.

It further emerges that as long as 1 and 1/2 years ago the President signed a secret directive, called by Reagan a secret diplomatic initiative vis-a-vis Iran. The head of the White House has admitted that the initiative, including the supply of arms to Iran, aimed to gain some access and influence within Iran, as well as in Iraq.

With this goal in view, the supply of arms to Iran was sanctioned, as were the secret talks with Robert McFarlane. With whom precisely the Washington emissary, a former national security adviser, was in touch, the President did not say. But he hastened to say that McFarlane's action was fully within the limits of U.S. law. McFarlane himself stated that he flew to the 4-day talks under his own name, not under an Irish passport, as the press asserted.

Reagan spoke as if no U.S. arms had been supplied to Iran, either directly from the United States, or via other states. However, in enumerating some countries which, according to reports which have appeared, could have acted as intermediaries in U.S. military deliveries, he did not mention Israel. It is precisely from Israel that the biggest shipments of U.S. arms have been made to Iran. Yesterday this was indirectly admitted by Rabin, the defense minister, himself -- if our greatest friend requests special favors, we provide them. These are the words of Rabin, the Israeli defense minister. How can one fail to agree with THE NEW YORK TIMES, which says that the White House has committed many blunders in this operation?

Immediately after the President's televised address, Thomas O'Neill, the speaker of the House of Representatives, stated that he had advised Hamilton, the chairman of the House of Representatives' intelligence committee to begin an urgent investigation into the methods and goals of the present administration's policies

Sailors and airmen, direct participants in operations to deliver arms to Iran, have also begun to speak out. They adduce various facts and reveal a variety of details. But their testimony has one thing in common: that the operations took place -- in an atmosphere of secrecy and deception, if you like -- but take place they did.

Over the past 6 years our ships have made more than 60 voyages to Iran with cargoes of U.S. armaments -- of course they were camouflaged, admits the vice chairman of the Danish seamens' union Henrik Berlau. Herman Duran, an American pilot from Florida, worked for International Air Tours, an airline, and in 1985 he regularly flew from Israel to the Iranian town of Tabriz, via Spain. He said: I was told I was carrying medicines and potatoes. I had no idea that the operation was secret, said another. What sort of airline is International Air Tours? It appears to be registered in Nigeria, but it belongs to a private Israeli joint-stock company. Dick Welman is the proprietor of another company, an American one this time -- International Airlines. He used to fly from the United States to Israel and on to Iran with a cargo of Hawk missiles designed for use against aircraft and anti-tank rockets -- all of U.S. manufacture.

Eventually Welman sold a transport aircraft to an Israeli company based in Nigeria. The handover of the aircraft took palce on Dutch territory, and was carried out by the pilot Herman Duran.

Turkatenko Views Aim of Sales

LD142022 Moscow TASS in English 2005 GMT 14 Now 86

[Text] Washington November 14 TASS -- TASS correspondent Nikolay Turkatenko reports:

In his remarks on American television on Thursday, President Reagan admitted that the USA had delivered weapons to Iran, but he claimed that those were "modest deliveries."

The President advanced a ridiculous argument in an attempt to justify arms supplies to a coutnry, which is at war with Iraq, albeit vis-a-vis the latter the U.S. Administration has more than once proclaimed its "strick neutrality." By supplying arms to Iran, the President said, the USA thus wishes to contribute. . . to bringing an end to the Iran-Iraq war.

It turns out that for almost a year and half now, as the President said, the USA "has had underway a secret diplomatic initiative to Iran," Reagan frankly admitted that that "Initiative," including arms supplies to Iran, was designed to "gain some degree of acess and influence within Iran -- as well as Iraq." It is precisely with that aim that the President, as he himself said, sanctioned arms shipments to Iran and secret talks with the people the USA maintained contacts. The President preferred not to specify with whom precisely such contacts were maintained and not to say to whom specifically the American weapons were shipped. This passing over in silence of the facts is proof that Washington has clearly set out to ensure for itself the possiblity for meddling in Iran's home affairs.

Unnamed high-ranking representatives of the administration, as the UPI Agency said, made explicit statements on that score. The agency quotes them as saying that the President signed a secret directive in January which is a deviation from the policy proclaimed towards Iran and sanctioning arms supplies to Iran in the interests of the USA, with the aim of winning the favours of moderates in Iran. In other words, stake is placed on pro-American circles in that country. Yet, to be precise, the point at issue is not only interference in Iran's affairs. Judging by the President's remarks the "secret initiative" pursues by far more ambitious aims. It is not for nothing that he stressed Iran's "critical geography," i.e. its strategically advantageous position and the fact that both Iran and the Middle East countries neighbouring on it have oil reserves.

The President refuted press reports to the effect that American weapons had been shipped to Iran via other countries. Yet in quoting these reports the President failed to mention among such countries Israel, while it is precisely from Israel that, according to newspapers, big supplies of American weapons to Iran were made.

To justify the hegemonistic designs of the USA vis-a-vis Iran and the whole Middle East and southwest Asian region, the President put forward the fantastic "argument" saying that the USA was saving Iran from. . . "Soviet domination."

Yet in real fact the objectives of Washington's strategy in those regions have long been an open secret. By shipping weapons to Iran, Washington has set out to meddle directly in the Iran-Iraq war in order to prevent its ending, since, in the first place, this war weakens both countries, and, second, undermines the positions of the Arab world in the fight against the Israeli aggression.

The UPI Agency stressed that Reagan's address on TV was arranged for by the White House in such a manner as to isolate him from representatives of the press and public. Thus the President was guarded against "inconvenient" questions and the need to give answers to them. Yet, it is clear already now, that his admissions and fantastic claims will hardly bring down the wave of criticism against the U.S. Administration over its policy on Iran, including in the USA itself. Right after the President's television address, Thomas O'Neill, the speaker of the U.S. Congress, said that he advised Lee Hamilton, chairman of the House Select Committee on Intelligence, to inquire urgently into the methods and aims of that policy.

COMMENTARIES HIT U.S. SANCTIONS AGAINST SYRIA

Attempt to 'Distract Public'

LD142206 Moscow TASS International Service in Russian 1902 GMT 14 Nov 86

[Text] Moscow, 14 Nov (TASS) -- TASS commentator Leonid Lapin writes:

The White House has announced a number of economic sanctions against Syria. In particular, the decision has been made to substantially reduce the American Embassy's staff in Damascus, not to return its ambassador there (he was recently demonstratively recalled to Washington), and to introduce restrictions on trade with Syria, especially on deliveries of spare parts for civil aviation equipment and computers.

Formally the anti-Syrian measures have been taken in the framework of the so-called "campaign of combating terrorism," which as we know is being used by Washington as a cover for the campaign against progressive regimes and movements. They are a direct consequence of the judicial farce which has ended in London, during which Syria was accused of "complicity in terrorism." As we know, relying on the decisions of this "court" the West European allies of the United States had earlier introduced their own sanctions against that Middle Eastern country.

However, as observers point out, the real aims of the anti-Syrian demarche go far beyond the framework of the notorious "anti-terrorist campaign." Above all, it comprises an attempt by Washington to give a fresh boost to the campaign of whipping up hatred and mistrust toward other countries and peoples and in this way to distract the attention of the public from pressing questions of nuclear disarmament, the solution to which is obstructed by the White House's militaristic course, to get the United States out of the international isolation into which it was driven by the administration's destructive position at Reykjavik, and to dampen mounting murmurings in the Atlantic Alliance.

The UP agency in particular noted that the long-promised announcement of sanctions against Syria was specially timed for the arrival of British Prime Minister Margaret Thatcher on a visit to the United States.

This is the first meeting of the leaders of the two countries since the Soviet-American summit meeting in Reykjavik, where the United States, trying to reach military superiority by means of the "Star Wars" program; wrecked the opportunity opened up by the Soviet Union to embark on far-reaching measures for the limitation and liquidation of nuclear weapons. Publicly demonstrating its "solidarity with London," which has of late been acting in the unedifying role of ringleader of the anti-Syrian campaign, the White House obviously expects that the guest, who has been accorded so much respect, will be obliged to reply in kind and not place the matter of the White House in an aukward position on the questions on which his position is especially vulnerable, especially in connection with the Reykjavik meeting.

As for the official pretest for the sanctions against Syria -- its imagined involvement in "international terrorism" -- this, in the words of THE WASHINGTON TIMES, French Prime Minister Jacques Chirac in an interview to that paper the other day declared that he considered the London trial and the accusations made there against Syria to be a provocation by Israeli intelligence aimed at discrediting the Syrian leadership.

Even in the eyes of the U.S. allies the White House's attempts to pose as an uncompromising "fighter against terrorism" looks clumsy and comic against the background of a scandal that is rocking America. This is caused by the exposures in the press of a secret operation by the White House to interfere in the Iran-Iraq conflict by means of arms deliveries to Iran, which the U.S. Administration also has on its "black list" of states aiding and abetting terrorism. This scandal testifies that in its actions in the international arena Washington is certainly not guided by principles of lofty morality, as it would like to convince the world, but by imperial designs, which do not hinder it, in the event, from entering into contact even with the most evil enemies.

Kulik Raps U.S. 'Allegations'

LD151705 Moscow TASS in English 1658 GMT 15 Nov 86

[Text] Moscow November 15 TASS -- TASS Political News Analyst Sergey Kulik writes:

The so-called "list of terrorist incidents" has been issued by the U.S. Department of State the other day. What it contains, however, are not facts but allegations aimed at proving something that cannot be proved: that it is Syria that is now the centre of international terrorism. The State Department even invented a figure -- 500. In the opinion of the State Department as many people were killed the world over with "malicious intent" of Damascus since 1983.

Alleging that Syrian leaders are "terrorists", Washington tries in vain for the umpteenth time to distract the attention of the world public from its own piratic policies in the world arena. And if a list of its terroristic acts be drawn up, the number of victims would be counted by thousands, hundreds of thousands, or even millions.

And the facts on that list would be real, undoubted ones.

It should be recalled that 40 thousand counter-revolutionaries are trained every year on U.S. funds to be used against the Democratic Republic of Afghanistan. And everyone of them is held duty-bound to kill "at least" ten persons.

No less than 35 thousand peaceful people were killed by CIA-financed "contras" in Nicaragua against which, as the authoritative international court in the Hague established, the Reagan administration is waging an undeclared war.

The damage to Angola's economy from actions of UNITA gangs which are also financed by the USA is estimated at 12 billion dollars. Anti-Mozambican terrorists from MNR whom leaders of the "Heritage Foundation", Ronald Reagan's associates, now intend for the "Maputo government", inflicted damage on the Mozambican national economy which can be estimated at no less than five billion dollars. Terrorist drove tens of thousands of African peasants out of their native areas, left them without means of subsistance, without shelter, deprived them of relatives and kin.

It is impossible to name all the victims of this criminal policy. But Indira Gandhi's killers were members of a group of terrorists. They underwent training at one of the special camps in the U.S. territory. Patrice Lumumba, Salvador Allende, Omar Torrijos, Maurice Bishop, Orlando Letelier, Aldo Moro, Arnulfo Romero are among political and religious leaders in whose murder the CIA is involved.

Facts show irrefutably that it is precisely Washington that wages undeclared wars against whole nations, stages political assassinations, and though the demagogy of politicos and ideologists of imperialism is nothing surprising, still one cannot but marvel at Washington's cynical attempts to try to justify the flouting of elementary standards of morality and civilised life and to blame its fault on others.

REAGAN SIGNS NATIONAL DEFENSE AUTHORIZATION ACT

LD150942 Moscow TASS in English 0811 GMT 15 Nov 86

[Text] Washington November 15 TASS -- President Reagan on Friday signed into law the National Defense Authorization Act for fiscal year 1987 that had been endorsed by the Congress. In a statement circulated by the White House in this connection the President stated he is "particularly pleased" with the fact that the Congress has endorsed appropriations for continued build-up of the U.S. military might, above all strategic offensive arms.

The act, specifically, envisages appropriations for the construction of 12 more MX inter-continental first-strike ballistic missiles and the continuation of the development of the new "Midgetman" nuclear ballistic missile. The act has the provisions to fully fund the request for the manufacture of cruise missiles and the new "Stealth" strategic bomber.

The act also sanctions serial production of the new generation of lethal chemical arms -- so-called binary ammunition. The President, however, expressed "disappointment" with some other provisions in tha act. He said he is "troubled" by the congressional decision that the funding levels requested initially by the administration for the "Star Wars" programme be reduced by 34 percent and concerned over a ban on ASAT testing against objects in space that will operate for one year.

CHINESE ACROBATS ARRIVE IN LENINGRAD 13 NOV

OW141250 Moscow in Mandarin to China 0200 GMT 14 Nov 86

[Text] The members of China's Shandong acrobatic troupe arrived in Leningrad on 13 November. They will give performances in Moscow. The Chinese acrobats toured Leningrad City and visited various places that have something to do with the Great October Revolution. In the evening, they watched "(?The Wild Geese)," a short drama adopted from (?Uzov's) modern drama. On the next day, they will meet with members of Leningrad's acrobatic troupe.

MOSCOW RADIO NOTES RUSSIAN ART SHOW IN PRC

OW121039 Moscow Radio Peace and Progress in Mandarin to China 0400 GMT 11 Nov 86

[Text] A Soviet exhibition of images of modern people in Soviet plastic arts opened in the Chinese capital on Monday. Displayed are 85 paintings and 23 sculptures by Soviet artists. Chinese Vice Culture Minister Gao Zhanxiang and Soviet Ambassador to China Troyanoskiy were present at the opening ceremony. The paintings and sculptures will also be shown in Shanghai after the exhibition in Beijing ends.

The art exhibition is being held in accordance with the 1986-87 plan on cultural cooperation between the Soviet Union and China. Cultural exchanges between the two countries have witnessed a marked increase in recent years. The Soviet Union regards this as an important component in the general trend to improve bilateral relations.

COMMENTARY VIEWS ECONOMIC COOPERATION WITH PRC

OW131302 Moscow Radio Peace and Progress in Mandarin to China 0400 GMT 7 Nov 86

[Ivanov commentary on Soviet-Chinese Economic and technological cooperation in recent years]

[Text] Experts of the state-run Mine Designing Joint Company in Leningrad returned from China not long ago. Their greatest achievement -- economic theory and technology for building a large opencut coal mine in northeast China -- was approved by the Chinese side. The Soviet experts were satisfied with this. The mine construction engineers from Leningrad proposed a series of unique economic and technological programs to relevant departments in China. For instance, they proposed that a new method of excavating coal in opencut mines be adopted. This method mainly involves the use of a Soviet-made excavator capable of excavating a few thousand cubic meters of coal seams per hour. It has been decided that this method will be used at the (Yininhe) coal mine not far from Hailar City. This is one of the 24 large industrial projects to be built or renovated with Soviet aid and will play an important role in the fulfillment of China's Seventh 5-Year Plan.

An agreement in this respect was signed between the Soviet Union and China last year when Chinese Vice Premier Yao Yilin visited Moscow. Chinese has known the Soviet Mine Designing Joint Company for a long time. Cooperation between it and various Chinese organizations began soon after the founding of the People's Republic of China. In the 1950's mine designing experts from Leningrad enthusiastically took part in building China's 23 coal mines.

Since the 1960's, cooperation between the two countries began to dwindle and remained stagnant for a long time, but this was not the fault of the Soviet Union.

In the past few years great changes have taken place in Soviet-Chinese relations. Economic ties and trade between the two countries have increased steadily. As was pointed out in Comrade Gorbachev's Vladivostok speech on 28 July this year, history has entrusted a particularly important mission to the Soviet and Chinese people. The development of the world depends to a great extent on the two largest socialist countries.

MOSCOW RADIO VIEWS PRC INDUSTRIAL PROJECT AID

OW120158 Moscow Radio Peace and Progress in Mandarin to China 0400 GMT 11 Nov 86

[by Station Observer]

[Excerpts] Twenty-seven years ago, in November 1959, China's first tractor plant -- Luoyang tractor Plant -- went into operation. On this, our observer made the following comments:

The 1950's witnessed many shining samples of effective and mutually beneficial cooperation between the Soviet Union and the People's Republic of China. During that period, China built more than 250 large industrial enterprises and other economic projects with Soviet economic and technological assistance. The Luoyang tractor plant was one of the major results of Soviet-China cooperation. This plant, together with other industrial enterprises built with Soviet aid, has faithfully served the needs of the Chinese people for about 30 years. [passage omitted]

Contacts between the Soviet Union and China have continued to expand in recent years. Leaders and political activists of both countries have met with each other from time to time. Delegations have been exchanged frequently, not only in the economic field but also in the cultural, sports, scientific, technologies, and other areas. In the summer of last year When Chinese Vice Premier Yao Yilin visited Moscow, an agreement was signed between the two countries on economic and technological cooperation in building and renovating industrial projects in China. According to the agreement, the Soviet Union will help China build 7 new industrial projects and renovate 17 large industrial projects constructed in the 1950's with Soviet aid. Among the renovation projects are the Anshan, Baotou, and Wuhan iron and steel plants, the Luoyang bearing plant, and the Luoyang tractor plant. The Soviet Union will supply the Luoyang plants with necessary equipment, and Soviet experts will be responsible for installing and adjusting the equipment.

JAPANESE DEPUTY FOREIGN MINISTER VISITS MOSCOW

Meets With Shevardnadze

LD142051 Moscow TASS in English 2025 GMT 14 Nov 86

[Text] Moscow November 14 TASS -- Eduard Shevardnadze, member of the Political Bureau of the CPSU Central Committee, USSR foreign minister, has received today Japan's Deputy Foreign Affairs Minister Shinichi Yanai, who is currently in Moscow in connection with the holding of consultations between the foreign ministries of the two countries at the level of deputy foreign ministers.

Eduard Shevardnadze pointed out the pressing need for the efforts of all states in the interests of strengthening peace, nuclear disarmament and preventing a militarization of outer space, the importance of their broad interaction so as to strengthen the fundamentals of international security.

He pointed out that the Soviet-American summit meeting in Reykjavik had been a major milestone, the results of that meeting marking important advances in mankind's progress towards non-nuclear world, accord with the interests of all states, all peoples. The settlement of the most important problem of the present -- nuclear disarmament has for the first time begun assuming a real shape. Yet, the stubborn wish of the U.S. side to sacrifice the elimination of nuclear weapons to the militaristic SDI programme, which is designed to ensure military superiority through the creation and placing of space strike weapons in near-earth space, is an obstacle on the way towards implementation of the agreement. The governments, which have decided to participate in that programme, should realize well their responsibility for the consequences for the destinies of the world and international security, which are involved in the militarisation of outer space. This, as was stressed, also concerns the Government of Japan.

The view was expressed of considerable potentialities for Soviet-Japanese cooperation in the context of a broad programme for strengthening peace and security in the Asian-Pacific region, which was put forward by Mikhail Gorbachev in Vladivostok on July 28.

Eduard Shevardnadze reaffirmed the Soviet Union's policy of developing goodneighbourly relations with Japan and stressed the importance of mutual efforts in that direction. A radical turn towards better in Soviet-Japanese relations would serve the best interests of both countries, the cause of peace and security in the Middle East and in the Asian-Pacific region as a whole. Concrete results can be achieved if the sides realistically appraise the situation, approach relations as a complex, rather than put forward any preliminary conditions and create artificial linkages in the development of some or other trends of mutually beneficial bilateral ties.

Shinichi Yanai said that the Japanese Government intends to broaden and raise the level of the dialogue with the Soviet Union. He set forth Japan's stand on some international issues and on questions pertaining to bilateral relations.

Holds Talks With Kapitsa

LD151230 Moscow TASS in English 1122 GMT 15 Nov 86

[Text] Moscow November 15 TASS -- Consultations between Soviet Deputy Foreign Minister Mihail Kapitsa and Japanese Deputy Foreign Minister Shinichi Yanai were held with the participation of groups of experts from both sides in Moscow on November 13-14.

During the consultations, the sides exchanged views on a broad range of topical international and regional problems, and discussed questions of Soviet-Japanese relations.

It was agreed to hold the next round of consultations between the foreign ministries of the USSR and Japan in Tokyo next year at a date to be fixed by the sides.

'BROAD MASSES' OPPOSED TO SDI PARTICIPATION

OW131432 Moscow in Japanese to Japan 1200 GMT 11 Nov 86

[Pavel Potapov Dispatch]

[Text] Broad masses of people in Japan are opposed to their country's participation in the U.S. Star Wars plan. Our Tokyo correspondent Pavel Potapov has filed the following report:

Since the Cabinet adopted the decision on Japan's participation in the SDI program on 9 September, the Liberal Democratic Party [LDP] has markedly intensified a propaganda campaign to justify this decision. The LDP asserts that Japan's participation in the SDI program does not conflict with the Diet resolution calling for peaceful use of space, and that the decision of the government and the LDP enjoys extensive support among the people.

Facts, however, significantly contradict the LDP's assertion. This observation is supported by recent developments. The government decision had the effect of adding fuel to the anti-SDI movement that had been gathering strength. Presently, not only opposition parties and antiwar groups but many scientists and public figures as well are opposing the dangerous LDP policy.

In the past several weeks, more than 6,000 people including scientists and engineers of major science and technology organizations signed resolutions and appeals against Japan's participation in the SDI plan. This reporter met the other day Mr Minoru Kitamura, a leading member of the Scientists Council of Japan. He had this to say: First of all, it should be pointed out that Japanese scientists believe that their research should be one for peace. The SDI plan seeks to use Japanese scientific and technological capabilities for military purposes. It extends nuclear arms race to space. We, therefore, are opposed to the U.S. strategical concept itself as well as to Japan's participation in the SDI plan. There are other reasons, too, for our decision to rise in a struggle against the Star Wars plan. The United States is attempting to obtain and monopolize Japanese technologies, high technologies in the electronics area in particular, within the framework of the SDI plan. As a result, Japan will be unable to make use of the results of research. This will certainly be a heavy blow to Japanese science organizations. The day after the government announced its decision on the participation in the SDI program, we issued a statement protesting the decision, noting that Japan's participation is not in the interest of our country which experienced the horror of nuclear arms.

SHEVARDNADZE RECEIVES BANGLADESH ENVOY 11 NOV

PM131451 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 13 Nov 86 First Edition page 4

[Text] Eduard Shevardnadze, member of the Political Bureau of the CPSU Central Committee, foreign minister of the USSR, on 11 November received Mir Mohammad Rezaul Karim, ambassador of the People's Republic of Bangladesh to the USSR, at the latter's request.

The ambassador said that martial law was lifted in Bangladesh on November 10 and the constitution was reenacted.

Shevardnadze expressed satisfaction with the restoration of democratic norms and wished success to the people and the Government of Bangladesh in social development.

The talks also centered on some issues pertaining to Soviet-Bangladesh relations.

Shevardnadze called the ambassador's attention to the situation evolving in the world following the Reykjavik meeting between Mikhail Gorbachev, general secretary of the CPSU Central Committee, and Ronald Reagan, U.S. President, and also to the need to step up the campaign for peace and nuclear disarmament.

SHEVARDNADZE RECEIVES INDIAN AMBASSADOR 11 NOV

LD112018 Moscow TASS in English 1938 GMT 11 Nov 86

[Text] Moscow November 11 TASS -- Eduard Shevardnadze, a member of the Political Bureau of the CPSU Central Committee and foreign minister of the USSR, today received the ambassador of the Republic of India to the USSR, Triloki Nath Kaul.

They discussed Soviet-Indian relations and some key problems of the present-day international situation.

Special stress was laid on the high importance of close, trust-based contacts existing between Mikhail Gorbachev, general secretary of the CPSU Central Committee, and Prime Minister Rajiv Gandhi of India. Emphasis was made also on their big personal contributions to developing friendship and cooperation between the Soviet Union and India.

Both sides reaffirmed a desire to further consolidate and broaden Soviet-Indian cooperation and improve the two countries' interaction on the international scene in the interests of strengthening general security and creating a nuclear-free world.

The meeting passed in a warm and friendly atmosphere.

TALKS, PROTOCOL WITH INDIAN MINISTER CONCLUDED

LD131127 Moscow TASS in English 1052 GMT 13 Nov 86

[Text] New Delhi November 13 TASS -- A protocol on trade between India and the Soviet Union for 1987 has been signed here. The protocol envisages an almost six-percent increase in the volume of Indian-Soviet trade as compared with the current year.

During the just-concluded talks in Delhi between the delegations of the Indian Ministry of Commerce and the USSR Ministry of Foreign Trade, the two sides expressed satisfaction with the fact that, notwithstanding the unfavourable world market situation, they managed to attain objectives in broadening bilateral trade. The two sides emphasised that the newly-signed Indian-Soviet protocol on trade would promote further strengthening of the traditional ties between the two countries.

"India and the USSR have a solid foundation for further expansion of trade-and-economic cooperation", V.P. Shiv Shankar, Indian minister of commerce, has said at a meeting with the Soviet trade delegation. "The foundation was reinforced during the last year's visit to the Soviet Union by Prime Minister Rajiv Gandhi of India and as a result of the joint cooperation documents signed in Moscow".

Next year the USSR will continue to supply India with a number of commodities which are wanted by various branches of the republic's industry. These are, in particular, machines and equipment, oil and oil products, non-ferrous metals, synthetic rubber, newsprint, and fertilizers. Apart from traditional export commodities, India, for its part, will deliver engineering products, freight containers, shoe uppers, sewn and knitted goods, chemical products, and pharmaceuticals to the Soviet Union.

KRASNAYA ZVEZDA VIEWS SERVICE IN PANJSHER VALLEY

PM121549 [Editorial Report] Moscow KRASNAYA ZVEZDA in Russian 8 November 1986 First Edition carries on page 4 under the rubric "Writer's Notes" and the headline "Ravine" a full-page 5,500-word report by Colonel Yuriy Belichenko on his visit to the DRA's Panjsher Valley. Belichenko was initially attracted to the area by Soviet soldiers' songs, the verses of two of which read "I am not an invader here, I am not a foreigner, I have come to defend a neighboring country..." and "Russian soldiers sleep uneasily on Afghanistan's scorched earth..."

After a long excursion into the history of Afghanistan in general and the Panjsher Valley in particular, Belichenko describes his meeting with a Major Petrov, who volunteered for the posting in order to check the value of his academy diplomas. The test was "tough" -- there were "attacks on posts by gangs. There was mortar shelling and machinegun fire from the dominating distant heights." Belichenko had been struck by how young the soldiers in the Panjsher were, and Petrov found on arrival that discipline was his main problem because the young junior officers "thought that while there was shooting going on a commander should be a commander, but when the shooting stopped strict regulations could go by the board." Petrov and his deputy political officer Aleksandr Litvinenko set about "restructuring subordinates' awareness."

In conclusion, Belichenko ponders "why any of these people" are prepared to "die in combat tomorrow." His answer is that they are ensuring "not only the free and independent future of the Afghan people but the lasting security of our fatherland's southern borders." As a postscript Belichenko quotes from a letter from Litvinenko, received 2 months after his visit, stating that Major Luksha, deputy commander of the unit, had been killed.

FURTHER REPORTAGE ON ALIYEV TALKS IN VIENTIANE

Meets Cambodia's Heng Samrin

LD151447 Moscow Domestic Service in Russian 1200 GMT 15 Nov 86

[Text] A meeting was held in Vientiane today between the heads of delegations of the CPSU and the Kampuchean People's Revolutionary Party [KPRP] taking part in the proceedings of the fourth congress of the Lao People's Revolutionary Party [LPRP] -- Comrade Aliyev, member of the CPSU Central Committee Politburo, first deputy chairman of the USSR Council of Ministers, and Heng Samrin, general secretary of the Central Committee of the Kampuchean People's Revolutionary Party, chairman of the Kampuchean Council of State. Also today, the CPSU delegation visited the "Lao-Soviet Friendship" polytechnic college in Vientiane. The members of the delegation viewed the lecture rooms and laboratories and chatted with students and teachers. A friendship meeting was held in the assembly hall, and it was addressed by Comrade Aliyev. The emissaries of Soviet communists then visited the museum of the revolution.

There was also a warm meeting between the CPSU delegation and the leaders and activists of the Lao-Soviet Friendship Society.

Aliyev, Kaysone Hold Talks

LD160752 Moscow TASS in English 0740 GMT 16 Nov 86

[Text] Vientiane November 16 TASS -- A friendly meeting was held here today between the CPSU delegation headed by Geydar Aliyev, member of the Politburo of the CPSU Central Committee and first deputy chairman of the USSR Council of Ministers, and Kaysone Phomvihan, general secretary of the Central Committee of the Lao People's Revolutionary Party and chairman of the Council of Ministers of Laos.

Aliyev warmly congratulated Phomvihan on the successful completion of the 4th LPRP Congress which became an important step in the political life of the party, of the entire Laotian society.

Phomvihan described the broad response within the party and the nation to the results of the congress and the decisions it adopted. He asked that cordial gratitude be conveyed to Mikhail Gorbachev, general secretary of the CPSU Central Committee, for his congratulations in connection with Phomvihan's election to the post of general secretary of the LPRP Central Committee.

The mutual determination was expressed to continue strengthening and developing all-round cooperation between the CPSU and the LPRP, between the USSR and Laos.

The meeting was attended by Sali Vongkhamsao, member of the Politburo and secretary of the LPRP Central Committee, deputy chairman of the Council of Ministers and chairman of the State Planning Committee of Laos.

SYRIA'S TALAS RECEIVES GENERAL IVANOVSKIY

PM141443 Moscow KRASNAYA ZVEZDA in Russian 13 Nov 86 First Edition p 3

[TASS report: "On an Official Visit"]

[Text] Damascus, 12 Nov -- M. Talas, deputy commander in chief of the Syrian Arab Republic Armed Forces and Syrian deputy prime minister and defense minister, has met with Army General Ye. F. Ivanovskiy, commander in chief of the Ground Forces and USSR deputy defense minister, who has arrived here on an official visit. Corps General H. Al-Shihabi, chief of the Syrian Armed Forces General Staff, participated in the talks, which were held in a friendly and businesslike atmosphere.

PRAVDA COMMENTS ON UK-U.S. 'ANTI-SYRIAN CAMPAIGN'

PM141155 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 12 Nov 86 First p 5

[Own correspondents A. Maslennikov and Yu. Glukhov reports followed by Vladimir Peresada "Observer's Opinion" under general heading: "Syria Will Not Be Intimidated"]

[Text] London, 11 Nov -- As has already been reported, a conference of Common Market countries' foreign ministers held here has decided to introduce sanctions against Syria because of its "complicity" in international terrorism.

And even though these accusations have not been proved, the British Government earlier announced the severance of diplomatic relations with the Syrian Arab Republic, demanding that its EEC partners and NATO allies do the same. Initially, a response to this call was forthcoming only from the United States, which recalled its ambassador from Damascus, and partly from Canada, whose government summoned the head of its diplomatic mission for consultations in Ottawa. As for Britain's other allies in the so-called "Western Alliance," they were evidently in no hurry to jeopardize their Near East interests to please the United States and Britain.

Nonetheless, London and Washington continued to build up the pressure and, as the results of the London conference showed, it was to some effect. The participants in the meeting agreed to ban military exports to Syria, to postpone previously planned exchanges of top-level visits with that country, to curb the activities of Syrian diplomatic missions, and also to step up surveillance of Syrian citizens traveling to West Europe for commercial and other business.

Commenting on the results of the meeting, Britain's THE GUARDIAN notes that only 11 of the 12 participants in the conference signed the communique, with the Great foreign minister refusing to join in the sanctions. The newspaper writes that the implementation of the planned sanctions will inevitably run up against considerable difficulties. "In any case," THE TIMES concludes, "one gets the impression that national economic and diplomatic interests took precedence over the need to take coordinated joint actions."

Damascus, 11 Nov -- The frenzied anti-Syrian campaign which has culminated in the rupture of Anglo-Syrian diplomatic relations and the instigation of European states to adopt "collective sanctions" against Damascus was calculated to intimidate the Syrians and generate panic and confusion. In actual fact it has produced the opposite results.

What is happening is a mobilization of not only the country's economic and human potential, but also its moral and psychological resources, its staunchness, endurance, and readiness to defend its chosen path.

An emergency session of the Central Council of the country's National Progressive Front -- the main political organization uniting Syria's leading parties, including the ruling Ba'th Party, the Communist Party, and a number of other parties -- was held. Speaking at the session, Syrian President Hafiz al-Asad exposed the West's attempts to implement neocolonialist plans by taking advantage of the propaganda ballyhoo around Syria. Imperialism, he declared, will never succeed in restoring its domination in the Arab East or in binding the Arab countries to itself. H. al-Asad noted the Syrian people's resolve to defend their gains regardless of any sacrifices. An appeal adopted by the National Progressive Front expresses loyalty to the country's principled and consistent policy of rebuffing imperialist conspiracies and attempts by the United States and Israel to impose a capitulationist settlement on the Arabs.

A wave of mass rallies by various public organizations and protest demonstrations against the crude interference in Syria's affairs has swept through the country, at enterprises and institutions and in education establishments and peasant cooperatives. The seventh conference of the General Union of Damascus Workers was held beneath the sign of enhanced vigilance and staunchness in resisting the global offensive which the forces of imperialism and Zionism are trying to launch against Syria.

Working Syria has responded to the challenge in a worker fashion. A day of voluntary labor was held throughout the country on 7 November. In the words of I. Nasir, chairman of the General Federation of Labor Unions, about 500,000 working people reported for work in factories, plants, and construction sites. On that day the working class proved in deed, rather than in words, its determination to support the country's progressive anti-imperialist course, I was told by Riyad Abdallah, one of the trade union leaders.

In conversation with your correspondent, A. Ahmar, assistant secretary general of the ruling Ba'th Party, sharply criticized Britain's decision to break diplomatic relations with Syria. The step by M. Thatcher's government, he noted, falls within the framework of the course pursued by the U.S. Administration in an attempt to dampen the international response generated by the Soviet peace initiatives. Such attempts to exacerbate local conflicts and establish neocolonialist domination are doomed to failure.

Observer's Opinion [subhead]

Thus the anti-Syrian campaign fanned by London and Washington has entered a new round. Following Britain's severance of diplomatic relations with Syria and the recall of the U.S. ambassador from Damascus, the Common Market countries' foreign ministers have adopted a plan of "collective sanctions" against Syria.

These sanctions, including "boycott" measures in the sphere of political, trade, and economic relations and air links, are based, like all the propaganda attacks on Damascus, on a single "argument" -- the claims by London and Washington that Syria supposedly encourages "international terrorism." And specifically on groundless accusations against Syrian officials of complicity in the failed attempt to blow up an Israeli aircraft at London's airport last April. And even more precisely, on "admissions" by the organizer of that action, who, incidentally, is not a citizen of Syria and has absolutely nothing to do with that country.

The Common Market countries' decision on sanctions against Syria was made under direct pressure from Britain, backed by the United States. It is no accident that the Washington administration immediately approved this step, REUTER emphasizes. At the same time, London's and Washington's West European partners refrained from taking the tougher measures which, according to reports, the head of Britain's foreign policy department had on a list in his briefcase. The machinery of traditional obedience to the "senior partner" failed to function completely, and there was some room left to display common sense. The point is that people in West European capitals understand well how dangerous it is to fall for a provocation instigated by the Israeli special services. This is a threat not only to economic ties between European countries and the Near East, but also to the very stability of that region, which is already sufficiently explosive. Does Europe need a new conflict on its doorstep -- this is the question!

As for the overwhelming majority of the world community -- dozens of states, including capitlist ones -- people there are convinced that the "anti-Syrian crusade" launched by the leading Western powers and Israel is an attempt to "punish" a sovereign Arab state for its independent course which obstructs the implementation of imperialist plans in the Near East. This is a dangerous undertaking fraught with serious consequences for its instigators.

NEW ENVOY APPOINTED TO REPUBLIC OF TUNISIA

LD082103 Moscow TASS International Service in Russian 1816 GMT 8 Nov 86

[Text] Moscow, 8 Nov (TASS) -- The USSR Supreme Soviet Presidium has appointed Vladimir Sobchenko as USSR ambassador to the Republic of Tunisia. The 56-year-old Sobchenko did party work when he was younger, and from 1980 to 1986 he was USSR Ambassador to Laos.

The Supreme Soviet Presidium released Vsevolod Kizichenko from the duties of USSR ambassador to Tunisia in connection with his transfer to other work.

ZVEREZ REPLACES AKOPOV AS ENVOY TO KUWAIT

LD171042 Moscow TASS in English 1038 GMT 17 Nov 86

[Text] Mosocw November 17 TASS -- The presidium of the USSR Supreme Soviet has appointed Ernest Zverev as ambassador extraordinary and plenipotentiary of the USSR to the State of Kuwait.

The Presidium of the USSR Supreme Soviet released Pogos Akopov of the duties of the ambassador extraordinary and plenipotentiary of the USSR to the State of Kuwait in view of his being transferred to another job.

Ernest Zverev was born in 1927. He has been in the diplomatic service since 1951. He has been working as senior assistant of the first deputy minister of foreign affairs of the USSR since 1968.

EMBASSY IN MAPUTO DENIES MACHEL BLACK BOX PACT

MB161416 Luanda Domestic Service in Portuguese 1200 GMT 16 Nov 86

[Text] The Soviet Embassy in Mozambique has categorically denied that its country has reached agreement with South Africa on decoding black boxes of the Mozambican presidential plane that crashed last month inside South African territory. An employee of the Soviet Embassy in Maputo told the Portuguese News Agency, ANOP, that statements by South African Minister of Foreign Affairs Pik Botha on an agreement reached with Mozambique and the Soviet Union on this issue were groundless. The racist minister said the day before yesterday in Paris [as heard] that one of the black boxes which contains the flight register of the Tupolev 134 plane would be given to Soviet investigators to be decoded in Moscow and that the other would remain in Pretoria.

The Soviet ambassador in Maputo added that the international commission of enquiry, which is investigating the causes of the accident that killed President Samora Machel, has not yet reached any agreement on the decoding of the black boxes due to the constant manuevers of the Pretoria racist regime.

This misleading statement by the South African minister was also denied in Moscow by Ivan Vasin, deputy Soviet minister of civil aviation. During a press conference Ivan Vasin denied that an agreement had been reached on where the decoding of the black boxes would take place. He also stated that a radio station operating inside South African territory could have drawn the plane off its flight route toward a rocky region.

AMBASSADOR TO MAURITANIA REPLACED BY KOMOGOROV

PM111333 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 10 Nov 86 First Edition p 8

[Unattributed "News Item"]

[Text] The USSR Supreme Soviet Presidium has appointed Comrade Leonid Mikhaylovich Komogorov USSR ambassador extraordinary and plenipotentiary to the Islamic Republic of Mauritania.

The USSR Supreme Soviet Presidium has released Comrade Ivan Stepanovich Spitskiy from his duties as USSR ambassador extraordinary and plenipotentiary to the Islamic Republic of Mauritania in connection with his retirement on pension.

BRIEFS

DELEGATION VISITS TANZANIA -- A visit to Tanzania by a delegation of the Soviet public headed by Vitautas Zenkyavichyus, a member of the presidium of the Soviet Committee of Solidarity With Asian and African Peoples, minister of foreign affairs of Lithuanian SSR, is over. The delegation also visited Angola and Zambia. Addressing a final press conference in Dar es Salaam; the head of the Soviet delegation noted that the main aim of the visit consisted of reaffirming to the peoples of the Frontline States the firm support by Soviet people for their struggle for independence against apartheid, colonialism, and neocolonialism. He stressed that in Angola as well as Zambia and Tanzania, the delegation had numerous meetings and conversations in the course of which numerous matters were discussed connected with the political and economic situation in Africa, and the development of the situation in the south of the continent. [Excerpts] [Moscow Domestic Service in Russian 1730 GMT 1 Nov 86 LD]

SUPREME SOVIET PRESIDIUM HOLDS SESSION

Ratifies Accident Convention

LD141719 Moscow TASS in English 1706 GMT 14 Nov 86

[Text] Moscow November 14 TASS -- The Presidium of the USSR Supreme Soviet has today unanimously ratified the convention on prompt warning on nuclear accidents and the convention on assistance in the emergency of of a nuclear accident or an emergency radiation situation, which were signed in Vienna on September 26, 1986.

A detailed reference of the conventions and of their significance for the development of cooperation among states in such a vitally important and promising field as peaceful uses of nuclear energy has been given at the meeting.

Summing up the results of the exchange of views, Andrey Gromyko, member of the Political Bureau of the CPSU Central Committee, president of the Presidium of the USSR Supreme Soviet, laid special emphasis on the broad worldwide support for the proposals put forward by Mikhail Gorbachev, general secretary of the CPSU Central Committee to create an international regime of safe development of nuclear power engineering on the basis of close cooperation of all countries developing nuclear power engineering.

The fundamentals of such a regime were outlined at the special session of the IAEA General Conference in September this year. We are grateful to all the countries and international organisations for their efforts made on that issue. The preparation at IAEA of two international conventions over such a short time is a convincing example that states can jointly look for and find a solution to the complex problems, interwoven in which are quite often politics and economy, scientific-technical and humanitarian aspects. The Soviet Union will further do its utmost to implement the programme put forward by us for the total and worldwide elimination of nuclear weapons. The regime of safe development of nuclear power engineering also can and must become a weighty contribution to the cause of ensuring universal security.

Reservation on Convention

LD141759 Moscow TASS in English 1741 GMT 14 Nov 86

[Text] Moscow, November 14 TASS -- The Presidium of the USSR Supreme Soviet has issued today a decree on the ratification of the convention on prompt warning on nuclear accidents and the convention on assistance in the eventuality of a nuclear accident or an emergency radiation situation, which were signed on behalf of the USSR in Vienna on September 26, 1986. The documents have been ratified with the following reservation:

The USSR will not consider itself to be bound by the provisions of Article 11 (Point 2) of the convention on prompt warning on a nuclear accident and Article 13 (Point 2) of the convention on assistance in the eventuality of a nuclear accident or an emergency radiation, situation which provide for the possibility of submitting a dispute between the participating states to arbitration or international court at the request of any side, and declares that consent of all sides in each individual case is necessary for submitting any international dispute to arbitration or international court.

Leaders at Session

LD150437 Moscow Television Service in Russian 1800 GMT 14 Nov 86

[From the "Vremya" newscast; report on 14 November session of the USSR Supreme Soviet Presidium]

[Text] A session of the USSR Supreme Soviet Presidium took place today in the Kremlin under the chairmanship of Comrade Gromyko. Matters were discussed in connection with the holding of the sixth session of the 11th convocation of the USSR Supreme Soviet. The USSR Supreme Soviet Presidium then considered the matter of the ratification of the convention on prompt warning on nuclear accidents and the convention on assistance in the event of a nuclear accident or an emergency radiation situation, which were signed in Vienna on 26 September 1986. Comrade Shcherbina, deputy chairman of the USSR Council of Ministers, delivered a report on behalf of the USSR Government which submitted these conventions for ratification.

In the report and speeches by participants in the session, a detailed reference was given of the conventions and of their significance for the development of cooperation between states in such a vitally important and promising field as the peaceful use of nuclear energy. It was stressed that the conventions submitted for ratification are in accord with the USSR Constitution and the foreign policy course conducted by the CPSU and the Soviet state, and that they meet the interests of the Soviet people.

Summing up the results of the exchange of views which took place, Comrade Gromyko stressed the widespread international support that had been given to the proposals put forward by Mikhail Sergeyevich Gorbachev to create an international regime for the safe development of nuclear power engineering on the basis of close cooperation between all countries. The Soviet Union will continue to do its utmost to implement the program put forward by us for the total and worldwide elimination of nuclear weapons. The regime of safe development of nuclear power engineering also can and should become a weighty contribution to the cause of ensuring universal security.

The USSR Supreme Soviet presidium unanimously ratified the aforementioned conventions. Taking part in the discussion of points on the agenda were: Comrades Kunayev, Shcherbitskiy, Demichev, Yeltsin, Slyunkov, and Solovyev.

SUPREME SOVIET SESSION BEGINS; GORBACHEV ATTENDS

LD170713 Moscow TASS International Service in Russian 0705 GMT 17 Nov 86

[Text] Moscow, 17 Nov (TASS) -- A regular session of the USSR Supreme Soviet -- the Soviet parliament -- opened in the Kremlin today. Taking part in its work are Mikhail Gorbachev, Nikolay Ryzhkov, and other Soviet leaders.

Sokolov Present at Session

LD170842 Moscow Domestic Service in Russian 0800 GMT 17 Nov 86

[Text] The sixth session of the USSR Supreme Soviet of the 11th convocation opened 1 hour ago in the Great Palace of the Kremlin.

The deputies and guests assembled for the joint sessions of the chambers greeted with applause Comrades Gorbachev, Aliyev, Vorotnikov, Gromyko, Zaykov, Kunayev, Ligachev, Ryzhkov, Solomentsev, Chebrikov, Shevardnadze, Shcherbitskiy; Demichev, Dolgikh, Yeltsin, Slyunkov, Sokolov, Solovyev, Talyzin, Biryukova, Dobrynin, Medvedev, Nikonov, Razumovskiy and Kapitonov.

The participants of the session unanimously endorsed the agenda and procedure. They decided to table for discussion the following matters:
-The state plan for the economic and social development of the USSR in 1987, and the progress of fulfillment of the program for this year;
-The USSR state budget for next year, and implementation of the budget for 1985;
-The work of the USSR People's Control Committee;
-The USSR draft law on individual labour activity; and
-Endorsement of decrees of the USSR Supreme Soviet Presidium.
-A report on the first question is now being delivered at the session by Deputy Talyzin, first deputy chairman of the USSR Council of Ministers and chairman of USSR Gosplan.

Agenda Confirmed

LD170803 Moscow Domestic Service in Russian 0730 GMT 17 Nov 86

[Text] The 6th session of the USSR Supreme Soviet of the 11th convocation opened 1/2 an hour ago in the Great Kremlin Palace. The deputies and guests welcomed Mikhail Sergeyevich Gorbachev and other leaders of the Communist Party and the Soviet state with a stormy and prolonged applause.

The session confirmed its agenda to include the following questions: Next year's state plan for the country's social and economic development and the progress in the fulfillment of this year's program; the 1987 state budget and the execution of the 1985 budget; the activities of the People's Control Committee; the draft USSR law on individual labor activity; and the ratification of decrees of the USSR Supreme Soviet Presidium.

The deputies then started to examine the first question. A report on next year's state plan for the country's social and economic development and the progress of fulfillment of this year's program is now being delivered by deputy Talyzin, first deputy chairman of the USSR Council of Ministers and chairman of the USSR State Planning Committee.

Marchuk, Shalayev Speak

LD171238 Moscow Television Service in Russian 1130 GMT 17 Nov 86

[From the "Novosti" newscast]

[Excerpts] The 6th session of the USSR Supreme Soviet of the 11th convocation has opened in the Great Kremlin Palace. [passage omitted] Video shows leaders entering, including Sokolov, who walks unaided, apparently without difficulty; the leaders are then shown seated as follows: on the right of the platform second row, left to right: Razumovskiy, Nikonov; third row, left to right: Shcherbitskiy, Kunayev, Medvedev, Kapitonov; fourth row, left to right: Dobrynin, Biryukova, Sokolov, Solovyev, Slyunkov, Shevardnadze can be seen seated next to Yeltsin in the fourth row. Also seen on the platform are First Deputy Premier Antonov; Deputy Premier Gusev, Voronin, Kamentsev; Maslyukov, and Sacherbina; Deputy Chairmen of the Soviet of the Union of the Supreme Soviet Paton, Kulova, Grishkyavichus; Deputy Chairman of the Soviet of Nationalities of the Supreme Soviet Lobacheva]

A report on the country's state budget for the next year and on the execution of the 1985 budget was delivered by Deputy Gostev, USSR minister of finance. [video shows Gostev speaking]

Speeches were then made by Deputy Marchuk, president of the USSR Academy of Sciences, and Deputy Shalayev, chairman of the AUCCTU [video shows Marchuk and Shalayev speaking]

With this the joint session of the Soviet of the Union and Soviet of Nationalities of the USSR Supreme Soviet concluded.

Talyzin Delivers Report

LD170912 Moscow TASS in English 0819 GMT 17 Nov 86

[Quotation marks as received]

[Text] Moscow November 17 TASS -- The highest growth of national income and industrial production in the eighties is being expected in the USSR this year -- thanks to measures on restructuring and accelerating social and economic development, Nikolay Talyzin, chairman of the State Planning Committee of the USSR (Gosplan), has pointed out.

He today delivered a report on the 1987 Draft Plan of the country's development at the session of the Supreme Soviet, currently under way in the Kremlin.

Noting that key development indicators were higher in 1986 than planned, Talyzin emphasized that transition to a new style in work was slow in some branches, and no qualitative breakthrough had as yet begun.

"1987 will become a year of the broad application of new methods of economic management. This is reflected in the plan: The national income is to grow by 4.1 per cent (the 1986 plan provided for a 3.9 per cent increase) and industrial output is to increase by 4.4 per cent (the 1986 plan -- 4.3 per cent).

Labour productivity will grow by four per cent. Measures have been defined for accelerating scientific and technological progress and ensuring faster growth of the output of machines."

The report pointed at the enhancement of the social direction of the plan -- three-quarters of the national income growth would be directed at raising living standards.

"1987 will see the growth of wages and salaries, higher payments and allowances, greater production of consumer goods and services and better food supply.

More houses will be built in 1987 than planned earlier. The increase will amount to about 250,000 flats compared with the average yearly level in 1981-1985."

Speaking about the USSR's foreign economic ties, Talyzin emphasized that socialist economic integration within the framework of the Council for Mutual Economic Assistance (CMEA) would broaden and deepen next year.

The Soviet Union, the speaker said, would continue economic and technological assistance to the developing countries in strengthening key brances of their economies.

"Trade and economic relations with the developed capitalist countries will continue to be carried out."

Gostev Speaks on Budget

LD170952 Moscow TASS in English 0936 GMT 17 Nov 86

[Text] Moscow November 17 TASS -- It is planned to fix the 1987 state budget of the USSR at 435.5 billion roubles in the revenues and at 435.3 billion roubles in the expenditures parts.

These figures have been given by Soviet Finance Minister Boris Gostev who addressed the session of the USSR Supreme Soviet in the Kremlin today with a report on the country's 1987 budget.

He observed that socialist economy proceeds constituted the decisive source of budget revenues.

The 1987 budget set aside 20.2 billion roubles for defence needs. The share of the allocations were preserved at the current year's level.

Gostev said that the USSR was invariably opposed to the senseless waste of immense labour, material and financial resources on the arms race.

First Joint Session Ends

LD171049 Moscow Domestic Service in Russian 1000 GMT 17 Nov 86

[Special correspondent Olga Vasilyeva report from the Grand Kremlin Palace]

[Excerpt] The first joint session of both chambers of the Supreme Soviet has just ended. The agenda was approved. I remind you that it includes issues of the country's plan and budget for next year, the work of the People's Control Committee and a bill on individual labor activity. The session will last for 3 days [as heard].

This morning the deputies heard reports on the plan and budget. The reports were presented by USSR Gosplan Chairman Talyzin and Finance Minister Gostev.

Well, what can I espcially emphasize in these reports? The results over 10 months of this year show that our economy is already now reaching the levels of the average annual tasks in the 5-year plan. But at the same time there has not yet been a noticeable quality breakthrough in many branches of the national economy. That is why next year will become a year of wide application of economy management methods. A number of union ministries and major associations and enterprises are going to work in conditions of financial autonomy. The basis of their work will be 100-percent fulfillment of contractual liabilities. This will become one of the most important assessment indices. But the leading place is, of course, taken by quality. [passage omitted]

Separate Debates Begin

LD171137 Moscow TASS in English 1119 GMT 17 Nov 86

[Text] Moscow November 17 TASS -- The USSR Supreme Soviet (parliament) opened a debate in the afternoon today on the drafts of the plan of the USSR socio-economic development and the budget for 1987. The debate runs separately in two chambers -- the Soviet of the Union and the Soviet of Nationalities.

The reports on the drafts of those documents were made at today's morning meeting.

The session of the Soviet parliament opened today.

GORBACHEV SPEAKS ON STATE ACCEPTANCE OF PRODUCTS

PM171141 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 16 Nov 86

["Conference at the CPSU Central Committee; Speech by Comrade M.S. Gorbachev" -- PRAVDA headline]

[Text] Comrades! The Central Committee Politburo considered it necessary to call the present conference at the CPSU Central Committee in order to discuss practical tasks linked with the implementation of the decision taken by the party and government of the introduction of state acceptance of output at enterprises of the industrial ministries.

We have invited secretaries of the Central Committee of the Communist Parties of the union republics, of kraykoms, obkoms and gorkoms, of the party, the leaders of central organs, ministries, associations, enterprises, specialists, scientists and people working for the technical control and state acceptance services.

Some of you might feel that you have been taken away from important business and that the agenda for the conference is not particularly important, or that it is routine, as we sometimes say. If any of you have come here with that kind of opinion I would ask you to get rid of it before the conference begins because that is a delusion.

In point of fact we are talking about an issue of enormous social and economic importance, because the result of the work of all branches of the economy is summed up in the quality of output. What we are talking about is the kind of output that is dispatched into the national economy, that determines its technical level, and that also determines the everyday living conditions of the individual and satisfies his needs, and hence the way people feel and their attitude toward all the processes that are taking place in the country.

The saturation of the market with articles of a high technical standard and with high quality consumer goods is the main sign of a full-blooded, flourishing economy. And, on the other hand, low quality and bad, careless work is the most dangerous form of squandering both social labor and material and technical resources and the whole of our national wealth overall. For generally speaking, comrades, the market in goods in our country is in many cases already being saturated and is approaching the optimum.

This work must be done dynamically in the future, so that production will not get into the state where people won't take what is being produced. There are already instances where many goods lie around not being bought. People must be offered new goods, with new consumer qualities, and then they will buy them, value them, and be appreciative.

If we look even now at the structure of our consumer goods in many ways we are even higher than the West and near to rational norms. At the same time we have a permanent shortage of many items. If these goods appear on the home market, but with the label "made in some West European country", they are snatched up. A crazy situation develops. Why? Because the majority of our goods are uncompetitive. At the same time, we know that there are instances where they stick a Western label on our good items and then they sell like hot cakes.

The way things go with the raising of quality is the way things will go throughout our economy. That in fact is how the question must be looked at.

If we produce all our output and goods with high quality then the question would be solved in many respects with regard to quantity too. It is absolutely essential to satisfy our economy and home market. Unless we make a powerful and profound spurt in this area of our economy we shall not be able to manage the fulfillment of our plans and the achievement of the aims we have set, and we shall disappoint the hopes that have arisen in our society and among our people.

In my trips and conversations I have sometimes heard the following argument: The Central Committee and the government are putting forward the task of acceleration, but surely acceleration can't be compatible with quality?

Comrades, acceleration must come only by means of high quality, by means of the best production with great productive capabilities that ensure savings of labor, resources, and technologies. Only by means of quality. Accelerations is indissolubly linked with quality. Anyone who thinks otherwise has still failed to understand what acceleration is. He thinks it means somehow, come on, get it out. He dosen't stop to ask himself: Do the economy and the people actually need it in this form? That kind of approach is not acceleration, it's the Stone Age from a modern point of view.

Acceleration above all through technical progress, through going over to new equipment and technology and activation of the human factor. The main thing is quality and once again quality!

That, strictly, is the price of this problem which to some people might appear to be ordinary and run-of-the-mill. Reality itself has placed issues of quality on the agenda. It has placed them sharply, very sharply at the center of the restructuring.

And we have formulated this position with precision, clarity, and certainty. I shall put it thus, comrades: it is your hands -- all those who are present here and represent equally the industries, party organizations and labor collectives -- it is your hands that hold the practical levers with whose aid the success of the great cause should be ensured. Today's discussion should be conducted precisely with a full comprehension of all this.

We should not be trying to persuade each other here or engage in self-accounting but share ideas on what is being done, what is to be done, what has been neglected, and where attention should be focused.

Comrades, a session of the USSR Supreme Soviet, which will adopt the state plan for economic and social development of the USSR for the 2d year of the 5-year plan, will start work in 3 days. Many of the secretaries, Supreme Soviet deputies present here are already familiar with the indicators of that plan. As we have already determined long ago, the current 5-year plan occupies a special place in our 15-year program, a key place. It is here that the main reserves of work done in advance will be created. Whatever we create in advance in the economy and in the field of management, whatever we do in advance from the point of view of the dynamism of the political process in the country and social policy, whatever we do in advance from the point of view of mastering new methods of work by the party and our cadres, all this will subsequently impinge on the results of our future 15-year work.

The current 5-year plan period, therefore, is the most difficult, most complex, but the most interesting 5-year plan period. In building up the dynamism of our work we are under an obligation to ensure that the main economic tasks are solved in an organic unity. It is precisely thus that the plan for the 2d year has been compiled -- acceleration of the rate of development, the cardinal renewal of production and technology, and ensuring that industrial manufactures and consumer goods are produced without fail at an increasingly high technical level and standard of quality. These are the main component parts of the philosophy of the plan for the 2d year of the 5-year plan period.

We have already begun our work on raising quality. In connection with this I want to remind you of the letter from the Central Committee "on a radical raising of the quality of output" to all party committees, local soviet and economic organs, to party, trade union and Komsomol organizations, to all working people -- a fairly frank party document that did not gloss over anything.

We have already begun work on this letter. And it is beginning to bear fruit. The call by the Central Committee for a decisive turning point in ensuring high quality of output has been received with understanding.

I could cite dozens of enterprises now where they have set about doing this in a proper fashion and have achieved within a short time a situation in which output, which formerly used to be accepted neither by the national economy nor by the internal market -- and certainly not by export -- is today selling like hot cakes. In other words we can do it, comrades, we can do it.

Nevetheless, things are not going as they should. It's not on the scale that's needed. And you leaders, both at the center and locally, know: it would appear that some work has been done under pressure from the Central Committee, there's been some talking, they have discussed the letter of the Central Committee, something has been started, but this work has not yet had its real turning point.

I am of course nowhere near naively believing that tomorrow or the day after tomorrow the whole 100 percent of engineering output being made will be in accordance with world levels. After all, to achieve that a lot of things have to be changed, everything has to be rethought, we have to begin by determining the direction in which to seek quality of goods, comparing it with the world level, design and then distribute them among enterprises, restructure equipment and technology, bring in cadres -- and all this of course demands time and effort. [paragraph continues]

But when I say that this work is slow in getting off the ground, no one can quarrel with that. Of course, it is a very difficult business, covering equipment, and the organization of labor, materials, manufactured items for further assembly, the competence of the staff -- everything. That, so to say, is what should crown our production, the final product itself. That is why I want to say yet again: improvements have started, changes for the better are taking place in this matter, but not on the scale we need.

And another thing -- I spoke about this at the 27th Congress, and remember how long we took to formulate this part.

How long are we going to go on with the situation in the national economy where not only those who make progressive, quality products live a decent life, but so do those who make any old thing. They live untroubled -- and what's worse, a person who produces garbage has an easier life, because the equipment is not being modernized, he doesn't need to strain himself, he doesn't need to overstrain his mental and nervous system. He gets his pay and his bonuses for useless or poor quality output.

If we were now to say to many people: You will put 100 percent of your output on the foreign market and whatever you earn is all yours, just get on with it. All 100 percent! But they'll be reduced to begging, because no one needs their low quality output. That's not the way, comrades.

In conditions of restructuring, questions of quality must be accorded a central place. It is essential to embark on more decisive measures in all aspects of work in raising quality. Here I attach a lot of importance to financial autonomy and its main principle: Whatever you earn, consume, use and divide according to final results.

And the end result is the output and the resources that have been earned with it. If the output is needed neither by the consumer nor by the national economy, then you will not get any earnings. And not having received any earnings you will have to think about how you are going to go on living in the future.

Of course, I do not want to say that that is how things have been today and that full financial autonomy is going to be introduced tomorrow. That does not happen. But it is, without doubt, correct that we must embark upon the solution of this task through financial autonomy. In some cases this task will be solved more quickly, in others more slowly. Everyone has his own rate of doing things, but it is imperative that we move along this path. And payment must be made for what has been created, according to its quality. And the earnings that are received are the well-being of the whole collective, the enterprise, and of each person with due consideration for his specific contribution which is recorded under conditions of financial autonomy. This has to be borne in mind.

The introduction of the state acceptance of output from 1 January 1987 is one of the cardinal steps and tough measures. If one takes into consideration the fact that as a rule this applies to our major associations which provide important output of the national economy, then we are facing a fairly serious task whose solution will be of enormous significance.

I will put it like this: We did not embark upon the introduction of state acceptance for no particular reason, this idea was not thought up just for its own sake. An experiment was carried out with this kind of work. I spoke about this at the June plenum of the Central Committee of the party. In particular I named the Moscow "Frezer" works. There the process of introducing state acceptance did not pass off painlessly. [paragraph continues]

At that enterprise it was discovered that their technology and documentation did not match the technology; the tooling, it turned out was not right, qualifications, so to speak needed raising and so on, and the incentives, and the output acceptance system, and the initial control, and the manufactures used in production: all at once, so to speak, a whole circle of problems took shape.

For several months they suffered. But later all indicators at Frezer improved. And people immediately saw for themselves that they could work properly and produce truly good products.

But here is a question: There are reports that state acceptance bodies, having barely come into the world, here and there have already sunk in the mire of bureaucracy and red tape. A tendency has appeared for paper-shuffling, new forms of accounting, not legalized by anybody anywhere, certificates and all sorts of memos. Now, this is disgraceful. If state acceptance is going to think of itself as some kind of special caste, which can only threaten and behave in a self-willed manner, it is no longer state acceptance. People who understand what's what should be selected right from the start, as the activities of acceptance bodies affect the fortunes of people, collectives and society as a whole.

People with a wide range of political and technical interests, who are literate and morally mature should be selected for state acceptance bodies.

This is where the role of the party committees must be seen. It is no secret that some leaders of enterprises argue more or less like this: Why should I give intelligent, skillful workers to the State Acceptance Service? They'll only go and twist my arm afterwards. This attitude means, Comrades, that this manager himself has not been restructured and has not realised the importance of what is happening.

Workers are needed whose hearts are in the common cause. When a representative of the State Acceptance Service sees that in this or that section that this or that item is being produced substandard, he'll go there himself, will call in the designer, the engineer, the technologist and organize the production process, and fight for quality along with the workers. That approach will arouse the right response among the people.

I think that in the remaining 1 and 1/2 months of the year we have to start special features on television and in the press about the preparation of enterprises and industries for the state acceptance process to recount extensively and interestingly the good frontranking experience in this business. Public opinion needs to be formed actively and aggressively, people must be prepared, and the idea behind what is happening must be explained.

I will put it like this: The fundamental issue in introducting state acceptance is the preparation for it. The way things go will depend on the way that the enterprises and the industry are prepared for the introduction of state acceptance. Given good preparation this process will proceed in substantial measure painlessly and without any particular shocks. On the other hand, serious complications are likely to arise in places where they consider that, well, there's nowhere for them to go, they'll still take the output all the same.

We cannot exploit socialism. Under socialism, they say, come what may they won't cast aside the labor collective in its misfortune, under socialism they will still find a solution. The local party organizations will begin telephoning the Central Committee getting them to pay irrespective of the manner in which they have worked.

And indeed there have already been such cases. For example, they brought in some particular line, they went over to new technology, they changed the norms, the loading, and the production changed. But they didn't work well with the people; they decided everything in their offices.

The approach to this has to be a statesmanlike one, not one that is formal and bureaucratic, so that social, economic and political distortions do not result. During the 1 and 1/2 months that remain it is essential that party committees do all that is necessary and concentrate on work with people. Think over everything and do everything that has to be done. The directions of the work are clear.

Everything has to be done with the participation of the people. An action of extremely great importance will not work if it is done high-handedly. And this measure -- the state acceptance of output -- is a very major one. Hence the demands now being made of the preparations are special ones, too. I am drawing your attention to all of this so that later if failures are discovered in some particular places we will be right in calling to account both ministers and leaders of enterprises and leaders of party organizations. And we will make them answer. I want to stress this aspect especially, the aspect of the organizational, political work, of the technical preparations for introducing such a major measure as state acceptance.

This has to be borne in mind: we have too much neglect here. A great deal has been let slip. For too long engineering and technical cadres and other workers in industry have become injured to mediocrity and have set their sights on lowered criteria. All this has to be put right, and put right resolutely. What is needed, therefore, is some great, serious, deep, and responsible work. There is no other way. We cannot reject this path; we have to go along this road. Intelligent, far-sighted, solid work is needed.

Issues concerning the strengthening of order and discipline continue to need party attention and support. Without order and discipline we will not solve anything. But there are people who say that they have put an end to drinking, that they have restructured, that they are now tired and exhausted. There are people who have thought that there has been enough talk about discipline, how long can one go on busying oneself with this.

This will not do. We still have not established order and discipline in a serious way. It will only be done in a serious way when every leader and especially every party committee understands properly the importance of these decisive factors in restructuring and in the functioning of our society in general, not just of the economy. There must not be any slackening of work in this sector. Discipline and order are the number one task. This has been the case and it remains so. We will therefore remind those who are going to be getting tired and those who become tired out that they have only themselves to blame.

We live at a time that is very tense and crucial for the destiny of our country and people. We must understand this clearly. Without resorting to big words I will say this: The period and the stage we are now going through is such that if we cope with the problems that face us, then this will have historic consequences for the country and its role in the world.

We hope that the conference will help us to draw lessons from both the positive experience, upon which light is evidently going to be shed here, and also from the negative side, for that, too, is experience. We must sort out thoroughly what has to be done in the changeover to state acceptance of output at the country's industrial enterprises from 1 January next year.

Zaykov Addresses Meeting

LD151508 Moscow TASS in English 1443 GMT 15 Nov 86

[Text] Moscow November 15 TASS -- A meeting was held at the CPSU Central Committee on November 14 to discuss questions pertaining to the introduction at the amalgamations and plants of the industrial ministries of the USSR of special non-departmental control bodies of state acceptance of products.

Mikhail Gorbachev, general secretary of the CPSU Central Committee made a speech at the meeting.

Lev Zaykov, member of the Political Bureau of the CPSU Central Committee, secretary of the CPSU Central Committee, stressed in his speech that the introduction of state acceptance is not an aim in itself. It shall not be viewed separately from the complex of measures being carried out to improve planning and management, place the amalgamations, plants and all industries to run along full cost-accounting principles, self-financing and profitableness, increasing the responsibility and independence of the plants, strengthening the stimulating role of the pay. These and many other measures have the aim of sharply improving the technical standards, reliability and quality of products, the quality of all of our work, Lev Zaykov said.

The introduction of state acceptance does not reduce only to the creation of an additional control section, he stressed, it takes a reorganization of the work done by all the participants in the production process -- workers, foremen, shop and plant managers.

Lev Zaykov pointed to the need for active and purposeful work to enhance the role of work collectives in increasing the organizational standards of labour, improving the quality of products.

DEMICHEV AT JOINT MEETING OF YOUTH COMMISSIONS

LD151430 Moscow Domestic Service in Russian 1200 GMT 15 Nov 86

[Text] A joint meeting of the Youth Affairs Commissions of the Soviet of the Unions and the Soviet of Nationalities of the USSR Supreme Soviet took place today in the Kremlin. The activities of the soviets of people's deputies of Bryansk Oblast in improving work with young people was discussed. The deputies noted that much is being done in the oblast for the training of the new generation. The rich revolutionary battle and labor traditions are being skillfully used. Attention was also paid to the need to help young people to play a greater part in the solution of economic and social problems and to set up for them the necessary conditions of work, daily life and leisure.

Comrade Demichev, candidate member of the CPSU Central Committee Politburo and first deputy chairman of the USSR Supreme Soviet Presidium, took part in the commission's work.

EARLY NOVEMBER WEATHER, CROPS STATUS REPORTED

PM141421 Moscow SELSKAYA ZHIZN in Russian 14 Nov 86 p 1

[Agrometeorologist N. Ignatova report under the rubric "The USSR Hydrometeorological Center Reports": "The Weather and the Crops"]

[Text] The dry and mild weather in most parts of the USSR's European territory lasted until the middle of the first 10-day period of November. Subsequently it became colder and rain fell in many areas. In a number of places a snow cover, 2-10 cm deep, formed. Conditions were favorable for the beginning of the wintering of winter grain crops. On most of the territory of the RSFSR Non-Chernozem Zone winter grain crops stopped growing 10-15 days later than normal.

In the south of Moldavia, the southern oblasts of the Ukraine, the south of Rostov Oblast, in Krasnodar and Stavropol Krays, and in the autonomous republics of North Caucasus where the warm weather in the main persisted, winter crops continued growing. The rain which fell toward the end of the 10-day period replenished the moisture reserves in the soil which favored plant growth and root formation.

In Transcaucasian republics the average air temperature was 1-3 degrees higher than normal. Maximum air temperatures remained between 17-21 degress. It rained frequently. Precipitation on most of the territory totaled between 25 and 55 mm, and between 65-140 mm in the western half of Georgia. Winter grain crops continued to grow thanks to the good moisture reserves in the soil.

Winter weather continued in the farming areas of Siberia and the northern oblasts of Kazakhstan, but the average air temperature for the 10-day period was 2-5 degrees higher than normal. In West Siberia, northern Kazakhstan, Krasnoyarsk Kray, and Irkutsk Oblast temperatures fell to 10-15 degrees below zero on certain nights. Precipitation occurred in the shape of snow. North of the line linking Kustanay, Tselinograd, and Semipalatinsk the fields are covered by 1-10 cm of snow, and 11-18 cm in some places in Kemerovo and Novosibirsk Oblasts and Altay Kray. In West Siberia winter grain crops were in a state of winter dormancy and the wintering of sowings proceeded favorably.

Winter has made itself felt in East Siberia, especially in Yakutiya, where temperatures have fallen to minus 35-38 degrees. However, in daytime the frosts have been insignificant so far.

In Central Asian republics the weather was summery. Average air temperatures were 5-8 degrees higher than normal. During the day air temperature rose to 25 degrees, and 30 degrees in some places in the extreme south.

AGRICULTURAL DEVELOPMENTS FOR 11-14 NOV REPORTED

LD170138 [Editorial Report] The following is a compilation of reports on agricultural developments in the USSR carried by Moscow Domestic Service in Russian, unless otherwise indicated, on 11-14 November. GMT times of broadcasts are given in parentheses at the end of each item.

11 November

According to the Tajik Central Statistical Administration, over 898,000 metric tons of cotton have been delivered in the Republic.

The farmers in the republic intend to produce at least another 12,000 metric tons. (0500)

Bashkiriya has fulfilled its plan on sales of sugar beets to the state: 1,315,000 metric tons have been delivered. (0700)

Surkhandarya Oblast has procured 500,000 metric tons of cotton since the start of the harvest; 87 percent consists of fine-fiber varieties. (0700)

12 November

The last metric tons of rice are reaching the procurement points in Krasnodar Kray with the plan being overfulfilled. A record crop of over 52 quintals per hectare has been achieved this year. (0300)

The kolkhozes and sovkhozes of the country have practically completed the lifting of sugar beets. According to the USSR state agro-industrial committee, over 70 million metric tons have been delivered to procurement points and sugar refineries. In contrast with previous years, the lifting took place in an organized manner. The farms of Belgorod, Kursk, and Orel Oblast were among the first in the RSFSR to fulfill their plans in the sale of sugar beets; in the Ukraine, Volhynia, Lvov, and Rovno Oblast were among the first. The sugar-growers of Lithuania and Belorussia quickly completed their harvest and fulfillment of the state plan. All the sugar refineries are now working at full capacity, on some days producing up to 2.5 million metric tons of sugar. Almost everywhere, more sugar is being obtained than in previous years from less raw material. (1900)

13 November

In Kazakhstan, the harvesting of spring crops has been completed. On 30 million hectares, grain, corn, groat crops have been reaped and threshed; sugar beet, potatoes and other vegetables have also been lifted. Despite difficult weather conditions, Kazakhstan has exceeded the annual plan for sales of grain to the state, and it has also produced a good crop of rice, corn and many industrial crops. (0700)

Tajik land cultivators have commenced above-plan sales of fine-fiber cotton. According to Statistical Administration data, 300,000 metric tons of raw cotton of particularly valuable strains have been delivered to the procurement points since the start of the harvest. Farms of Kurgan-Tyube Oblast, the main zone of cultivation of fine-fiber cotton, yielded more than 90 percent of the harvest. Our correspondent notes that the annual plan for gathering the raw cotton here was fulfilled for the first time in 5 years. Moreover, this high yield has been attained under difficult weather conditions. (1400)

Autumn plowing has been carried out on 350,000 hectares in Kirghiziya; less than 100,000 hectares remain to be ploughed. (0900)

14 November

Cotton harvesting is now complete in Tajikistan. Ploughing is now in progress, as well as general preparation of the land for spring sowing. Over 300,000 hectares of cotton fields have to be prepared in the republic as a whole. Today sees the end of fodder gathering in Kazakhstan. Meadow and sown grasses have been cut from over 32 million hectares throughout the republic. (1200)

Tajik cotton-growers have sold to the state 300,000 metric tons of valuable fine-fiber cotton. To date, a total of over 906,000 metric tons of cotton have been delivered to procurement points. (1430)

TASS NOTES COSMOS, MOLNIYA SATELLITE LAUNCHES

Cosmos-1791 Nov 13

LD131448 Moscow TASS International Service in Russian 1428 GMT 13 Nov 86

[Text] Moscow, 13 Nov (TASS) -- Another artificial earth satellite, Cosmos-1791, was launched in the Soviet Union today.

The satellite carries scientific apparatus for continuing space research.

The satellite has been placed in an orbit with the following parameters: initial period of revolution, 105 mins; apogee, 1026 km; perigee, 972 km; orbital inclination, 83 deg.

Besides scientific apparatus, the satellite carries a radio system for the precise measurement of orbital elements and a radiotelemetry system for transmitting to Earth data about the work of the instruments and scientific apparatus.

The apparatus aboard the satellite is working normally.

The coordinating and computing center is processing the incoming information.

Cosmos-1792 Nov 13

LD141223 Moscow TASS in English 1218 GMT 14 Nov 86

[Text] Moscow November 14 (TASS) -- An artificial earth satellite, Cosmos-1792, was launched in the Soviet Union on November 13.

The satellite carries scientific equipment for further exploring outer space.

The satellite was put into orbit with the following parametres:
initial period of revolution -- 89.6 minutes,
maximum distance from earth -- 357 kilometres,
minimum distance from earth -- 181 kilometres,
orbit inclination -- 64.9 degrees.
The equipment on board the satellite is functioning normally.

Molniya-1 Nov 16

LD170735 Moscow TASS International Service in Russian 0712 GMT 17 Nov 86

[Text] Moscow, 17 Nov (TASS) -- Another communications satellite, "Molniya-1," was launched in the Soviet Union on 16 November 1986. The communications satellite "Molniya-1" is designed for long-distance telephone and telegraphic radio communications, and also the broadcasting of USSR central television programs to points in the "Orbita" network.

The satellite has been placed in a high elliptical orbit with an apogee of 40,817 km in the northern hemisphere, and a perigee of 469 km in the southern hemisphere. The satellite's period of rotation is 12 hours 16 minutes, and its inclination of orbit is 62.5 degrees.

Communications sessions via the "Molniya-1" satellite will be carried out in accordance with the set program.

LEADERS RECEIVE FURTHER GOSR GREETINGS

SRV Sends Greetings

PM141435 Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian 7 Oct 86 Morning Edition p 5

[Message of greetings from Truong Chinh, general secretary of the Communist Party of the Vietnam Central Committee and chairman of the SRV State Council; Pham Van Dong, chairman of the SRV Council of Ministers; and Nguyen Huu Tho, chairman of the SRV National Assembly, to the CPSU Central Committee, USSR Supreme Soviet Presidium, and USSR Council of Ministers on the occasion of the anniversary of the Great October Socialist Revolution -- date not given]

[Text] To the CPSU Central Committee
USSR Supreme Soviet Presidium
USSR Council of Ministers

On the occasion of the 69th anniversary of the Great October Socialist Revolution -- glorious festival of the Soviet people and working people of the whole world -- we send the most cordial congratulations to the CPSU Central Committee, USSR Supreme Soviet Presidium, USSR Council of Ministers, and the entire fraternal Soviet people.

The history of social development has known no event to compare with Great October in terms of the power of its impact on the destiny of mankind. The victory of the October Revolution and the birth of the world's first worker-peasant state ushered in a new era in the history of mankind -- the era of the collapse of the imperialism and victory of socialism and communism worldwide.

In the past 69 years, following the course of Great October, the Soviet people, under the leadership of the glorious CPSU, have traveled a path filled with difficulties and hardship and, at the same time, remarkable victories and have ensured the reliable defense of their homeland, which has created favorable conditions for the triumph of socialist revolution in a whole series of European and Asian countries and in many other parts of the world and for the emergence of the world socialist system, which became a decisive factor in the development of human society.

The Vietnamese people are sincerely glad about Soviet people's immense achievements in comprehensively improving socialist society and communist building in the spirit of the decisions of the 27th CPSU Congress.

In the current tense international situation, which has taken shape through the fault of the United States and other bellicose imperialist forces, the Soviet Union conducts a consistent, peace-loving course and invariably displays good will and high responsibility for the destiny of peace and the peoples' security.

The Vietnamese people highly value and fully support the Soviet Union's initiatives set out in the recent exceedingly important speeches by CPSU Central Committee General M.S. Gorbachev concerning the halting of nuclear explosions and the nonmilitarization of space, as well as the USSR's specific proposals aimed at the stage-by-stage elimination of the threat of nuclear war and the creation of an all-embracing system of international security in order to reliably safeguard peace and ensure equal and mutually advantageous cooperation in the Asian-Pacific region and all over the world, which is the common task of the socialist countries and revolutionary and peace-loving forces.

Our people are deeply aware that without Great October and without the Soviet Union's decisive victory in World War II there would have been no August revolution and no new, Socialist Vietnam. Every victory achieved by the Vietnamese revolution in building and defending the motherland is bound up with the Soviet Union's great and effective assistance.

We note with deep satisfaction the steady development and strengthening of the fraternal friendship and comprehensive cooperation between the parties and peoples of our countries, which are founded on the immortal principles of Marxism-Leninism and socialist internationalism and on the Treaty of Friendship and Cooperation Between Vietnam and the Soviet Union. The recent meetings between the top party and state leaders of Vietnam and the Soviet Union demonstrated the complete unity of views and the common resolve of our parties and countries to continue comprehensively strengthening the ties of friendship and cooperation and effectively coordinating collaboration between the SRV and the USSR in the international arena in the interests of the two countries' peoples and in the name of peace and socialism.

On behalf of the Communist Party of Vietnam, the SRV Government, and the Vietnamese people we express sincere gratitude to the CPSU, USSR Government, and fraternal Soviet people for the enormous, valuable, and effective assistance and support for the Vietnamese revolution.

We wish the Soviet people under the glorious CPSU's leadership new, even bigger victories in fulfilling the grand tasks determined by the 27th CPSU Congress to implement the program for the country's socioeconomic development through the year 2000 and in the struggle for peace and international security.

May the great friendship, militant solidarity, and comprehensive cooperation between the two countries' parties and peoples steadily strengthen and develop!

Truong Chinh, general secretary of the Communist Party of Vietnam Central Committee and chairman of the SRV State Council
Pham Van Dong, chairman of the SRV Council of Ministers
Nguyen Huu Tho, chairman of the SRV National Assembly

DPRK Greets Ryzhkov

PM141142 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 9 Nov 86 Second Edition p 4

[Message of greetings from Kang Song-san, premier of the DPRK Administration Council, to N.I. Ryzhkov, chairman of the USSR Council of Ministers, on the occasion of the anniversary of the Great October Socialist Revolution -- date not given]

[Text] To Comrade Nikolay Ivanovich Ryzhkov, chairman of the USSR Council of Ministers.

On the 69th anniversary of the Great October Socialist Revolution I send you warmest congratulations and comradely greetings.

As a result of the victory of the Great October Socialist Revolution the Soviet people, under the leadership of Lenin and the Bolshevik party, created the world's first worker-peasant state and built a socialist power with durable economic might and defense capability, and are today carrying out major revolutionary transformations and achieving labor successes in all spheres of public life in accordance with the party's strategic course of accelerating the country's socioeconomic development, the course outlined by the 27th CPSU Congress.

We rejoice sincerely, as if they were our own successes, in the successes achieved by the fraternal Soviet people in implementing the great cause of socialism and communism, and we express full support and firm solidarity with the Soviet people's struggle to cut short and thwart the reckless intrigues of the imperialists in building up nuclear arms and to ensure lasting peace and security on our planet.

Allow me to take this opportunity to express confidence that the friendly Korean-Soviet relations, which were strengthened still more in the course of the recent meetings and talks between our two countries' leaders, will continue to expand and develop into relations of true friendship and cooperation between class brothers, the indissoluble allied relations of comrades in the revolution, and to wholeheartedly wish you and the Soviet people further great successes in the struggle to achieve scientific and technical progress, ensure the intensive, rapid development of the Soviet economy, boost the people's well-being on the basis of Soviet society's tremendous potential, and improve socialism in every way.

Kang Song-sam,
Premier of the DPRK Administration Council.

Lao Leaders Send Message

PM141140 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 9 Nov 86 Second Edition p 4

[Message from Kaysone Phomvihan, general secretary of the Lao People's Revolutionary Party Central Committee and chairman of the Lao Council of Ministers, and Phoumi Vongvichit, acting president of Laos, to M.S. Gorbachev, A.A. Gromyko, and N.I. Ryzhkov on the October Revolution anniversary -- date not given]

[Text] To Comrade M.S. Gorbachev, general secretary of the CPSU Central Committee;
Comrade A.A. Gromyko, chairman of the USSR Supreme Soviet Presidium;
Comrade N.I. Ryzhkov, chairman of the USSR Council of Ministers

Dear Comrades!
On behalf of the Lao People's Revolutionary Party [LPRP] Central Committee, the Supreme People's Council and Council of Ministers of the Lao People's Democratic Republic [LPDR], and all of the Lao people and on our own account we send to you and, through you, to the CPSU Central Committee, the Supreme Soviet and Council of Ministers of the USSR, and all the fraternal Soviet people warm greetings and sincere good wishes on the 69th anniversary of the Great October Socialist Revolution.

The victory of the Great October Socialist Revolution under V.I. Lenin's brilliant leadership, a victory that led to the creation of a socialist state, the world's first state of workers and peasants, is a great event and has profound international significance. It opened a new era -- the era of the transition from capitalism to socialism throughout the world.

The Soviet people, raising the victorious flag of the revolution and displaying great heroism, resolutely overcame all kinds of difficulties, successfully broke the ring of the blockade and rebuffed the intervention by imperialist states and the forces of counterrevolution, and reliably defended the gains of the socialist revolution. In the period of the Great Patriotic War the fraternal Soviet people achieved the feat of crushing Hitlerite fascism, thereby creating the conditions for the emergence of the world socialist system; they delivered mankind from slavery and fascist domination and brought freedom and happiness to the peoples of the world.

On the basis of labor traditions and creative initiatives, the courageous Soviet people achieved great successes in building the motherland, turned the Soviet Union into a great and mighty socialist power, created a durable economic and defense potential, and made the Land of the Soviets the reliable bulwark of the peoples fighting for peace, freedom, national independence, and social progress.

We admire the outstanding victories of the communists and the fraternal Soviet people, achieved in the course of fulfilling the decisions of the 27th CPSU Congress and the 12th 5-Year Plan for the socioeconomic development of the USSR.

The Lao people have always valued highly the Soviet Union's peace-loving, principled, and consistent foreign policy, aimed at ending the arms race, creating an all-embracing system of international security, averting the threat of nuclear war, and ensuring lasting peace throughout the world.

The party and state and all the multinational Lao people are proud of the continuous fruitful development of relations between the parties, states, and peoples of Laos and the Soviet Union on the basis of the immutable principles of Marxism-Leninism and socialist internationalism.

May we take the opportunity, on this ceremonial occasion, to express profound gratitude to the party, the state, and the fraternal Soviet people for their support and invaluable all-around assistance to the cause of the Lao revolution and now in the defense and building of our socialist motherland.

We wish you, the communists, and the fraternal Soviet people great new successes in the cause of the all-around improvement of socialism, in the struggle for peace, and in the triumph of the great Lenin's cause.

Kaysone Phomvihan, general secretary of the LPRP Central Committee and chairman of the LPDR Council of Ministers;
Phoumi Vongvichit, acting president of the LPDR.

Ortega Greets Gorbachev

PM161443 Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian 13 Nov 86 Morning Edition p 4

[Message of greetings from Daniel Ortega, president of Nicaragua, to M.S. Gorbachev, general secretary of the CPSU Central Committee, on the occasion of the anniversary of the Great October Socialist Revolution -- date not given]

[Text] To Comrade Mikhail Sergeyevich Gorbachev, general secretary of the CPSU Central Committee

Dear Comrade!

Allow me on behalf of the National Leadership of the Sandinist National Liberation Front [FSLN] and the government and people of Nicaragua to congratulate the CPSU, the government, the Soviet people, and you personally on the 69th anniversary of the victory of the Great October Socialist Revolution, which falls on 7 November 1986.

The imperialist blockade and attacks on the Soviet Union with the aim of destroying the gains of the young October Socialist Revolution were futile, and the fascist onslaught in 1941 also failed to produce any particular results since, despite the 20 million killed and the enormous destruction, your country managed to rise from the ashes and become, together with the other socialist community countries, the bulwark of peace, solidarity, friendship among peoples, and internationalist cooperation.

We have followed with interest the numerous Soviet initiatives put forward in recent months with the aim of halting the escalating arms race, delivering the world from the nuclear threat, and forestalling its extension into space. There is no need to stress that Nicaragua, whose people know all about war, supports these initiatives which have been recklessly rejected by the Reagan administration.

During all the difficult years of trials our people have always known who are their enemies and who are their friends. Since the victory of its revolution, Nicaragua has enjoyed the Soviet Union's disinterested and benevolent support in the most varied spheres of the country's life, and we are confident of the Soviet Union's further militant and firm fraternal solidarity, the solidarity of its working people, men, women, and children.

For this reason, as we have said many times and will say everytime we are asked, for the Nicaraguans friendship with the Soviet Union is not a bargaining chip.

In the prevaling complex international situation, in conditions of disrespect for the most elementary norms of international law, especially now when the U.S. Administration is trying to lay down for governments and small countries who should and who may or may not be their friends, it is important to emphasize this principled stand based on national dignity.

Comrade Gorbachev! Allow me to assure you, the members of the CPSU Central Committee, all Soviet Communists, and the entire Soviet people of our profound gratitude and appreciation for the numerous manifestations of internationalism on your part toward our people. Please accept also our congratulations on the occasion of the 69th anniversary of the Great October Socialist Revolution.

With fraternal greetings,
Daniel Ortega Saavedra, coordinator of the FSLN National Leadership Executive Committee and president of Nicaragua.

Hasani Greets Gromyko

PM141138 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 9 Nov 86 Second Edition p 4

[Text] To Comrade Andrey Andreyevich Gromyko, chairman of the USSR Supreme Soviet Presidium

On the 69th anniversary of the Great October Socialist Revolution, on behalf of the peoples and ethnic groups of Yugoslavia and on my own account, I send to you, esteemed Comrade Gromyko, to the USSR Supreme Soviet Presidium, and to the friendly Soviet people cordial congratulations and best wishes for prosperity and new successes in socialist building.

I wish to take this opportunity once again to express satisfaction with the successful development of friendly relations and all-around, mutually advantageous cooperation between our countries on the jointly adopted principles. We see them as a firm foundation and broad framework for such development in the future too. We are convinced that this meets the true interests of the peoples of our two socialist countries and promotes the cause of peace, equal international cooperation, and universal progress throughout the world.

Sinan Hasani,
President of the SFRY Presidency.